

ROANOKE CITY COUNCIL

October 3, 2005

9:00 a.m.

The Council of the City of Roanoke met in regular session on Monday, October 3, 2005, at 9:00 a.m., in the Emergency Operations Center Conference Room, Room 159, Noel C. Taylor Municipal Building, 215 Church Avenue, S. W., City of Roanoke, with Mayor C. Nelson Harris presiding, pursuant to Chapter 2, Administration, Article II, City Council, Section 2-15, Rules of Procedure, Rule 1, Regular Meetings, Code of the City of Roanoke (1979), as amended, and pursuant to Resolution No. 37109-070505 adopted by the Council on Tuesday, July 5, 2005.

PRESENT: Council Members Brenda L. McDaniel, Brian J. Wishneff, M. Rupert Cutler, Beverly T. Fitzpatrick, Jr., Sherman P. Lea and Mayor C. Nelson Harris-----6.

ABSENT: Council Member Alfred T. Dowe, Jr. -----1.

The Mayor declared the existence of a quorum.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Darlene L. Burcham, City Manager; William M. Hackworth, City Attorney; Jesse A. Hall, Director of Finance; and Mary F. Parker, City Clerk.

COMMITTEES-SCHOOLS: A communication from Mayor C. Nelson Harris requesting that Council convene in a Closed Meeting to discuss vacancies on certain authorities, boards, commissions and committees appointed by Council, and to interview applicants for a vacancy on the Roanoke City School Board, pursuant to §2.2-3711 (A)(1), Code of Virginia (1950), as amended, was before the body.

Vice-Mayor Fitzpatrick moved that Council concur in the request of the Mayor to convene in Closed Meeting as above described. The motion was seconded by Council Member Lea and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members McDaniel, Wishneff, Cutler, Fitzpatrick, Lea and Mayor Harris-----6.

NAYS: None -----0.

(Council Member Dowe was absent.)

CITY COUNCIL-CITIZEN OF THE YEAR: A communication from Mayor C. Nelson Harris requesting that Council convene in a Closed Meeting to discuss nominations for Citizen of the Year, pursuant to Section 2.2-3711 (A)(10), Code of Virginia (1950), as amended, was before the body.

Vice-Mayor Fitzpatrick moved that Council concur in the request of the Mayor to convene in Closed Meeting as above described. The motion was seconded by Council Member Cutler and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members McDaniel, Wishneff, Cutler, Fitzpatrick, Lea and Mayor Harris-----6.

NAYS: None -----0.

(Council Member Dowe was absent.)

ITEMS LISTED ON THE 2:00 P. M., COUNCIL DOCKET REQUIRING DISCUSSION/CLARIFICATION, AND ADDITIONS/DELETIONS TO THE 2:00 P. M., AGENDA: NONE.

TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION BY THE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF COUNCIL: NONE.

BRIEFINGS:

ART MASTER PLAN: The Mayor advised that following the briefing on the Art Master Plan, the Plan would be referred to the City Planning Commission as a part of the process to consolidate the Arts Master Plan in the City's Comprehensive Plan, and the Art Masters Plan would be brought back to the Council for formal adoption.

Kathleen Lunsford, Chair, Roanoke Arts Commission, stated that the Public Art Plan is an economic development tool that will attract visitors to the area to review the City's public art collection and to generate revenue for the City. She expressed appreciation to Council Member Cutler for guiding the Arts Commission from the early stages of the Plan, and to Mayor Harris for his support of the arts in general, and for the attendance by Mayor Harris and Council Member Cutler at the various workshops.

Ms. Lunsford presented the following draft of the Public Art Plan:

Public Art Plan: History

- 2002: Percentage for Arts Funding Enacted
1% of public construction dollars earmarked for Art
- 2003: Council Approved Plan Development
Roanoke Arts Commission asked to spearhead bid process
- 2004: Consultants Chosen: Barney & Worth of Portland, Oregon
Firms were interviewed from Virginia and the United States

Public Art Plan: The Process

- Public Art Steering Committee was chosen consisting of:
Arts Commission members
Community, business leaders
Artists, urban planners
Tourism industry representatives
City staff and elected officials
- Consultants conducted in-depth Web surveys
Hundreds of responses were received
- Interviews with Stakeholders
More than 60 key stakeholder one-on-one interviews with public officials, community leaders, interested citizens
- Public Workshops Held
Community workshops were held in March, April, and May which were attended by a large cross-section of citizens
Student workshop was held at William Fleming High School

The Results: Community Vision

- Roanoke can become known as an arts community.
Unique opportunity: Opening of the Art Museum
- Public art can contribute to quality of life.

- Public art must be inclusive.
- Public art should reflect what's unique about Roanoke.
- Public art can bring the community together.
- Selecting public art should be a team process.
- Leverage percent-for-art into additional funding.
- A well-run program will need professional support staff.

Plan Priorities

- Incorporate public art into community life
- Recruit professional staff to direct the program
- Establish a protocol for maintenance
60 pieces of artwork are currently in the system
- Commission prominent artwork early on
Market Square, other highly visible locations

What is Public Art?

Public Art is more than paintings and statues

- Examples:
 "Dancing on Broadway" (A commissioned artist placed throughout the city pairs of different dance steps in the sidewalks.)
 "Rose City Labyrinth" (Portland, Oregon) (An artist placed terrazzo tiles in a design in reference to a painting.)
 "Manhole Cover" (Portland, Ore.) (An artist painted the manhole covers. (Benches and manhole covers could be painted as a reflection of the creative elements within the City.)

How Do We Pay for It?

Public Art Funding

- Utilize Percent-for-Art funds
Three years accumulation available: \$573,000.00
- Support administrative staffing cost during start-up, utilize expertise of Arts Council
Five-year, renewable commitment recommended
- Encourage private development and funding from other sources
Fund administration – place money with the Foundation of Roanoke Valley so that control is maintained over spending
- Grants from private foundations because of non-profit designation; State, Federal resources

Where Do We Go From Here?

Action Plan gives a three-tiered approach

Immediate

- Adopt Public Art policy
- Assign professional staff (utilize Arts Council of the Blue Ridge)
- Establish a Public Art Trust Fund to steward public monies
- Implement an art selection/procurement process
Selection process includes community input, citizen panels
All final decisions still rest with Council
- Commission first key pieces in conjunction with opening of Art Museum
- Attend to maintenance/curatorial needs (old and new artwork)
- Build public support for the program

- Develop interpretive signage
- Complete inventory of existing art

Three Years

- Install major commissions to coincide with Art Museum opening
- Seek opportunities to place art in upcoming projects
- Enact additional funding sources
- Conduct public education campaign

Four Years or more

- Broaden placement, expand opportunities around City
- Organize community events and festivals around public art
- Forge links with nearby communities to pursue collaborations; create a “public art trail”

Public Art Plan: Goals

- Enhance Quality of Life for Citizens
Create a visual, accessible art chosen with community input
- Create Heightened Sense of Community
Choose art that’s distinctive and unique to Roanoke
- Enliven Visual Quality of Public Space
Over time, distribute art to all parts of the City
- Stimulate Roanoke’s Vitality and Economy
Expand tourism draw of Link Museum and Art Museum

Council Member Cutler expressed appreciation to all persons who were responsible for preparation of the Art Master Plan. He stated that the City has a duty to inventory and care for its extensive art collection; however, the City currently has no in-house staff or expertise, therefore, the most efficient solution, as suggested in the report, would be to contract with the Arts Council of the Blue Ridge to serve as the City's art staff until a Public Art Director is employed, with a clear delegation of authority and sufficient funds to administer the program. He stated that in referring the draft Public Art Plan to the City Planning Commission, the Planning Commission might encourage Council to direct City staff to develop a response to the recommendations, including a draft contract with the Arts Council of the Blue Ridge as the agency to administer the City's Public Art program as recommended in the study.

Council Member McDaniel inquired if there are plans to inventory other forms of public art, such as the Dalhouse Panel, the H & C Coffee Sign, and the Airport sculpture; whereupon, Susan Jennings, Executive Director, Arts Council of the Blue Ridge, stated that the above referenced items are City-owned pieces of art, and the Art Council has prepared a larger inventory which includes regional pieces.

Council Member McDaniel inquired if it was realistic to expect the City to make a decision regarding commissioned art to be completed prior to the opening of the Art Museum; whereupon, Ms. Lunsford stated that a major piece of art could be commissioned and completed by the opening date, but a massive collection could not be compiled by that time. She called attention to the results of electronic polling at one of the workshop sessions which revealed that a significant piece of art should be in place in the City Market area near the entrance to the Art Museum. She stated that it may be possible to accomplish certain small things and/or one major piece, but it would be necessary to act quickly if it is to be accomplished prior to the opening by the Art Museum. She added that public art is extremely controversial and it would be necessary to take into consideration that there will not be a 100 per cent approval rating on a particular piece of art.

Ms. Jennings stated that every neighborhood has a distinct personality and could have a voice in the decision making process as to the type of art that is selected, with the understanding that they do not have to like all things about the selection.

Vice-Mayor Fitzpatrick expressed appreciation for efforts by the Arts Council and the Roanoke Arts Commission. He stated that he supported the desire to prepare a Public Arts Plan that will expand and broaden the minds of the City's citizens and visitors through the display of public art; however, he expressed concern that there are not enough water features in the proposed Arts Plan. He added that water could be combined in various creative ways, and referred to the symbolism of the northwest rivers in Portland, Oregon. He suggested that it should not be forgotten that the real heritage in Roanoke was transportation, a particular emphasis should be placed on transportation as the City looks to the future, Roanoke's citizens should be proud to live in a railroad town and part of that pride could be created in retrospect to public art. He noted that public and private art projects should include places that can be carved out for sculpture, or other kinds of art, particularly in those instances when a person is constructing a building to make a profit; and the City of Roanoke wishes to create a growth corridor between downtown Roanoke and the Carilion Bio-Medical Center and there are numerous places within the corridor for this type of art.

Council Member Wishneff inquired if there is an involvement or connection with downtown planning. He stated that it would be an ideal opportunity to locate municipal art near the Art Museum; and since the City is interested in creating and designating a cultural district in the downtown area, the matter could be discussed at future meetings of the Roanoke Arts Commission and/or the Arts Council.

Mayor Harris commended efforts to establish a Public Art Plan, and stated that funding for the Percentage for the Arts Program has been supported by current and previous City Councils, and it is hoped that more public art initiatives will be launched that will be an outgrowth of the Public Art Plan. He presented the following suggestions which would be helpful as the Public Art Plan proceeds through formal steps toward adoption:

- Some of the words "will" contained in the Public Art Plan should be converted to "should" in conformity with other types of master plans adopted by Council, inasmuch as they are adopted on a conceptual basis to help guide Council's thinking, planning and decision making process, and would help to avoid future confrontations.

- There should be a follow up with the consultant regarding citizen input and diversity, resulting in an appendix to the report because there were interesting questions about representational art vs. abstract art, paintings vs. sculpture, downtown vs. neighborhoods. When one serves on a decision making body that ultimately makes the decision on pieces of public art, the information would be helpful as an indicator of the community's interest and perspective on existing public art and the future direction of the City.
- There should be a review of the art inventory process so that Council will be the beneficiary of additional information on the mix of art, what makes a well balanced and comprehensive public art program, and whether or not there are any deficiencies that need to be addressed initially in order to achieve a better balance.
- The City Market area needs a piece of public art.

The Mayor advised that he planned to visit certain entranceways/gateways to the City and the various neighborhoods with members of the Roanoke Arts Commission to determine which would be a natural complement to a piece of art.

LIBRARY STUDY UPDATE: Rolanda B. Russell, Assistant City Manager for Community Development, recognized Bill Hidell of Hidell and Associates Architects, Laura Katz of Katz-McConnel Architects, and Florence Mason of F. Mason and Associates, for presentation of the Library study.

Ms. Mason, a librarian and independent library consultant from Dallas, Texas, presented the following information:

Key Recommendations which stem from conclusions of the findings:

Collections

- Needs improvement
- Funding has declined – there is an inability to buy collections that are typically found in peer libraries that provide quality services
- State aid to localities has been cut by over one-third in the past three years

Facilities

- Facilities are not meeting the needs of residents, design configuration was appropriate for the 1960's and 1970's, but are not the kind of facilities found in contemporary, branch and main libraries across the United States
- Small in dimension – largest branch is 6,700 square feet compared to today's contemporary branch which is in the 12,000 square foot range
- Lack of adequate seating – books compete for seats and seats compete for computer technology
- Lack of adequate lighting inside and outside which affects security and the overall experience of using the facility
- Parking is not sufficient at a number of the branch libraries

Programs

- Core model for contemporary libraries is to provide a variety of programs for different age groups, i.e., allowing young children to sit on the laps of their mothers; consumer issues for adults; book clubs, etc.; and programs that are provided during the day and into the evening
- Not enough space for staff to develop programs
- Contemporary libraries provide program space that accommodates adult patrons who want to sit down and have a cup of coffee, children who want to listen to audible stories, and teenagers who want to interact with their peers, or work on a group project that may be related to their school work; allow for crafts associated with a story hour; afford an opportunity for the display of art; and provide meeting and conference space

Service Delivery and Customer Service

- Population that would most benefit from improvement to library facilities, services, staff, collection and programs would be to those who are historically and economically disadvantaged

Comparative Data from four different sets of libraries:

- State of Virginia annual reports were used to provide consistency in data reviewed for performance indicators or pinch points; starting in 1999, data showed that over time, output measures (service transactions) have gone down, which indicates that facilities and the capability of delivery space of the libraries has become a significant pinch point to be able to accommodate the kinds of demands that are routinely made on a contemporary library
- Check out data, program attendance data, budgeting for purchasing materials, and the number of questions that are answered in the library are below the level of other peer libraries in terms of the number of service transactions and show a decline over the years
- Neighborhoods are loyal to community libraries which are social icons and are incorporated into the community for long periods of time
- Community loyalty needs to be recognized and honored in any planning and decision making as the City moves forward with regard to expansion, renewal and revitalization of the library system
- Library staff is a valued asset – they work hard, are dedicated and have skills to bear; at times the staff is overworked and stressed when trying to maintain the level of service that customers would like to receive; there is currently less than one-half staff person per 1,000 population
- The Virginia Room staff, services and collection represent something unique and is recognized as an important asset by those inside and outside the community
- The customer base for the City's library system is shifting away because the library does not provide the kinds of things that customers are interested in – customers prefer to go to bookstores where they can shop, interact and enjoy coffee, etc., others visit the County library and/or other library services
- It is important to win back the hearts and minds of the library customer by providing library services that people want

Recommendations:

- Coordinate or consolidate selected library operations
- Design and construct new library facilities to include neighborhood libraries, full service libraries and resource or regional libraries
- Integrate technology in the operation and delivery of all library services
- Increase staffing to provide a more comprehensive public service
- Improve upon the existing collection in all formats, book and media
- Develop a comprehensive customer service model
- Integrate non-traditional library services and programs with core library services
- Market the libraries through developing partnerships – possibilities exist with the Art Museum, Higher Education Center, City schools, and a number of other institutions in the City of Roanoke
- Continue to monitor user trends and advertise library services
- Build on a three-tier library system
- Develop full service branches
- Name a central facility for housing central staff and administrative services
- Improve and expand current holdings in various forms, create multi-media and electronic collections which would involve an investment in terms of adding to the current collection of materials budget
- Implement technology into library environments which would cause them to be more user friendly
- Provide citizen users with expectations that will have access to laptops and wireless access

- Provide self-checkout and a Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) material handling system
- Bring staffing level up from .45 equivalent staff positions (FTE) per 1,000 population to .75 equivalent staff positions (FTE) per 1,000 population
- Critical staff needs include three to four Children's Librarians, two – three Young Adult Librarians, an Adult Program Manager, a full time Development Department, an Assistant Director, and a Facilities Manager

Brief overview of implementation of strategic plan or schedule:

- Build a full service branch somewhere inside the service area, with investment in state-of-the-art technical service
- Invest in the improvement and expansion of collections
- Invest in service delivery systems by adding staff and technology
- Revitalize all of the libraries across the library system by accommodation of kiosks, retail lease space, and renovation and addition of existing branches, full service branches, and revitalization and replacement of the Main Library as a regional resource library

Costs – Four Library Facilities of various models that would be implemented over time:

- Three full service branches
- One regional resource library (a/k/a Main Library)

Phase I:

- Construction of a super branch (demonstration branch) which will prove that the contemporary library will be a magnet within the community
- Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) technology
- Self-check with supportive technology

Phase II:

- Renovation/enlargement of a branch to become a full service branch with the attendant technology enhancements

Phase III:

- Regional resource (Main Library) (\$19,000,000.00)

Phase IV:

- Super branch with technology

Phase V:

- Renovation and expansion of neighborhood branch models

Total Capital Cost Estimates (Pre-Katrina):

Facilities and Technology - \$ 41.5 million

Phased In Facilities Operational Costs - \$ 1 to \$.9 million

Council Member Cutler stated that the Library report was harsh, but accurate; Roanoke has neglected its library system, and public libraries deserve the same high level of attention and support as sports venues and art museums. He stated that the process of review and recommendation to Council and the steps for implementation of recommendations should be taken seriously; budgetary considerations should be included in the budget study process; and there are opportunities for partnerships with the Jefferson College of Health Sciences, Virginia Western Community College, and the Roanoke City Public School System.

Council Member Lea referred to the statement that there is a 61 per cent citizen non-use of the library system, and inquired if the reason is because the City's libraries do not offer the services or technology that citizens want; whereupon, Ms. Mason advised that the figure was derived by making random telephone calls to people, which revealed that a large percentage of citizens do not use Roanoke City libraries, some use Roanoke County libraries because the materials they need can be found at the County libraries; some persons noted that some of the books in the County libraries were actually City books that were there as a result of the shared systems; and Roanoke County libraries offer a wide variety of programs and services that are found in a contemporary public library.

Council Member Lea stated that Roanoke County has indicated that it is not interested in a regional library concept; whereupon, Mayor Harris stated that several months ago, Roanoke County agreed to participate in a comprehensive review of both the City and the County library systems, and much of the data is captured in the consultant's report; certain initial findings were presented at a joint meeting with the Roanoke County Board of Supervisors; and the Chair of the Roanoke County Board of Supervisors and the County Administrator recently advised that it is the preliminary opinion of the Board of Supervisors that Roanoke County is not interested in proceeding with a merger of the two library operations, which information was later communicated to the Council. He added that Roanoke County's position was a disappointment to the City of Roanoke, especially when the main conclusion of the comprehensive valley wide Library Study was to merge operationally the two systems. He noted that telephone surveys conducted by the consultant revealed that the perception of library customers in the Roanoke Valley is that there is one library system, because the ability to check out and return books through either library system lends itself to that perception rather than two library operations. He noted that the consultants pointed out that merger benefits are obvious, i.e.: economy of scale, flexibility to meet changing customer demands, and alleviation of staffing needs by merger of certain operational functions allowing more customer service oriented activity; and many of the City and County branch libraries have overlapping service areas, and merging certain functions, staff and operations would economize library service delivery. He stated that he did not want to give up on the concept of merging the two library systems and would pursue the matter in a friendly and amicable way with Roanoke County.

The City Manager advised that the Library Plan would ultimately be referred to the City Planning Commission, but the document would first go back to the Library Steering Committee and the Roanoke Public Library Board for review, prioritization and recommendation, with the understanding that certain issues may need to be reviewed prior to referral to the Planning Commission and there will be more opportunities for community review. She added that it is hoped that the Library Plan will become a part of the City's Comprehensive Plan.

Council Member Wishneff inquired as to the size of the main library as envisioned by the consultant; whereupon, Ms. Mason stated that the number quoted in the consultant's report is in the 60,000 to 75,000 square foot range, the City's current main library contains 58,000 square feet, and a new main or regional resource library would be located in a new super branch. She stated that the public service area would be larger than space now occupied at the current main library.

Mr. McConnel stated that the Law Library and the Virginia Room would be given greater prominence in the central location. He further stated that the notion that there is one main library and the branches are subservient should be avoided because in the super branch mentality, the "library" is the primary location and only for specialized reasons would one need to go to another library. He noted that information taken from the interviews during the study revealed that most people are not satisfied with the library because there are two separate halves which are difficult to maintain and have low staffing levels; design for a regional branch does not fit the building and it remains to be seen if the building could be modified. He stated that the Library Study should be considered rather than the Outlook Downtown Roanoke Plan which was the Vision 2020 Plan, and the current main library facility is ill-suited for delivering expected services.

Council Member Wishneff inquired if the School Administration envisions any cooperative sharing of facilities and staffing; whereupon, Ms. Mason stated that there was support for the evolution of the school library system with the larger library facilities because it is understood that public libraries support school age children, but no facilities in specific areas were discussed.

The City Manager called attention to experience in certain other localities that use joint facilities, some of which were successful and some were not; and the City of Roanoke conducted a pilot test using the Williamson Road Branch Library, which is located in front of a middle school, with the idea of expanding library services, however, the program was not successful.

Council Member Wishneff inquired if naming rights to the library facilities could be sold to help offset the cost of renovation and improvements; whereupon, Mr. McConnel responded in the affirmative.

Council Member McDaniel stated that the Library Study reveals that the City's library system is inadequate and the community is ready for quality library facilities; therefore, she encouraged the Library Board and the Library Foundation to establish priorities and to focus on budgetary requirements. She inquired about the possibility of merging the City and County library systems; whereupon, the City Manager stated that the administration was waiting for completion of the Library Study as a point at which to begin recruitment of a Library Director on a permanent basis because the Library Director should be involved with implementation of the Library plan. She stated that she supports the Mayor's comments that the City of Roanoke has not given up on the concept of a more regional library system.

Council Member McDaniel requested that grammatical and spelling errors contained in the consultant's report be corrected before the presentation is made public.

With regard to interaction with the leadership of Roanoke County, Mayor Harris added that the County indicated that if both communities look at additional branch libraries or relocation of certain libraries, Roanoke County would coordinate efforts to ensure that the location of the libraries and service areas do not overlap, and there would be some ongoing cooperation in the area of technical services. He stated that while the County's initial response was somewhat disappointing, he was confident that the City would continue to pursue the matter, because the main thrust of the concluding section of the consultant's report was to reach an optimum level of service delivery as a library system in the Roanoke Valley, which would involve a merged library system. He further stated that it would be helpful to have research data from other communities that would show, through demonstrated data driven evidence, that investing in new or expanded library facilities, upgrading collections and increasing staff, would create a return on the investment by virtue of increased use of the library system by the populations within those communities. He added that such specific data would be advantageous to the Council's budget setting policy and in articulating to the community that increased funding to the library system in a variety of ways would benefit the community.

Mr. McConnel called attention to an addition to the Hollins Branch Library and advised that library usage increased by almost 50 per cent over night. He stated that supportive data of that nature would be provided to the Council.

Mayor Harris advised that a similar presentation would be made at a City of Roanoke Public Library System Community Meeting to be held on Monday, October 3, 2005 at 6:00 p.m., in Fitzpatrick Hall at the Jefferson Center.

COLONIAL AVENUE/WONJU STREET UPDATE: The City Manager recognized Kenneth King, Jr., Manager of Transportation, for an overview regarding traffic congestion on Colonial Avenue and Wonju Street, S. W.:

Mr. King advised that:

- There is a desire is to improve traffic operations/transportation system in the area of Colonial Avenue, Wonju Street, and Brandon Avenue, S. W.
- An early Alternate to the problem was an extension of Wonju Street to tie in with Brandon Avenue

- A strategy was developed from discussions during the I-73 and U. S. Route 220 project study
- There is a desire to improve current conditions rather than a complete overhaul of a given area or construction of a new highway
- There is a possibility of utilizing existing 23rd Street by making improvements to intersections and traffic signal timings, which would relieve backup traffic congestion on U. S. Route 220, and should be an early implementation phase of any of the three Alternate scenarios that might be selected
- Over \$800,000.00 was received in local partnership with State funds to add to the Transportation Program, which enabled the shifting of \$800,000.00 in Federal funds to another project
- The timetable for implementation of early improvements and encumbrance of funds is September 2006
- The ultimate Alternate will be selected through a public process, which will include traffic simulations so that the public will more easily see the benefits of each scenario

Rob Peery, Assistant District Engineer, Virginia Department of Transportation, presented the following overview of the Wonju Street Project:

- The project was added to the Six Year Plan in 1999 with the original intent of extending Wonju Street
- Scenarios: Alternate 1 – Extend Wonju Street straight through from U. S. Route 220 to Brandon Avenue (Cost – Approximately \$21 million); Alternate 2 – Extend Wonju Street straight through with a curve and flow directly into Brandon Avenue (Cost – Approximately \$18 million); Alternate 3 – “T” into Brandon Avenue (Cost – Approximately \$1 to \$2 million)
- Initially, traffic modeling was not complete, but the process enabled development of an initial phase which would afford improvements along Colonial Avenue through intersection improvements, coordinating traffic signals, adding turn lanes, and restricting some movement to make traffic flow better, which became known as Alternate 3

- Alternate 3 has merit in that it could become a long range solution by widening the ramp coming off U. S. Route 220 (I-581) to provide dual left turns going out Colonial Avenue toward Virginia Western Community College and beyond, and restricting access into the first entrance to Towers Shopping Mall by right-in, right-out access only
- During the process, if public feed back indicates a considerable amount of interest in proceeding with one of the other larger Alternates which would involve more time due to considerable right-of-way acquisition, there could be a quick solution for traffic improvement during the interim by linking signals and some relatively small improvements to the roadway
- VDOT's concern is to relieve backed-up traffic on U. S. Route 220
- Currently about 23,000 vehicles per day travel Colonial Avenue; Alternates 1 and 2 would increase traffic to about 28,000 per day; and Alternate 3 would increase traffic to about 25,000 vehicles per day

Council Member Wishneff inquired as to what, if any, impact that restriction of a left-turn from Colonial Avenue onto 23rd Street would have on traffic in Alternate 3; whereupon, Mr. Peery stated that Colonial Avenue traffic would travel down to Brandon Avenue, with dual left-turn lanes, and without that restriction, there would not be an acceptable level of service in the area. In further discussion, Mr. Peery advised that Alternates 1 and 2 would require acquisition of residential and commercial property, while Alternate 3 would not require acquisition of any property.

Mr. King stated that Alternate 3 is focused primarily on traffic operational improvements, which is an early stage improvement, and may provide an ultimate solution to vehicular traffic needs; and what Alternate 3 does not cover may become a potential subsequent project which would involve the improvement of Colonial Avenue from Overland Road to Brandon Avenue because the scenario did not fully address streetscaping, bike lane considerations, curb, gutter, sidewalk and street trees, etc.

Council Member Wishneff stated that there should be an alternate plan for the restriction of a left-turn onto 23rd Street because there may be a considerable amount of opposition to the restriction.

Vice-Mayor Fitzpatrick stated that he has seen numerous opportunities to improve Colonial Avenue and Brandon Avenue over the years, but he does not share Mr. Wishneff's concerns regarding the restriction of a left-turn onto 23rd Street, there is a precedent that traffic movement must come before personal preferences, otherwise the system will break down, and motorists will appreciate the ability to travel through a difficult intersection. He stated that the majority of traffic at the interchange is connected to Virginia Western Community College, therefore, it would be helpful to review future traffic projections at that location. He called attention to an existing problem of going from two lane traffic to one lane traffic toward Virginia Western, the original proposal for a crossing at Overland Road with a full interchange would have been the solution to the problem, and encouraged future review of the proposal.

Council Member Cutler stated that if Alternate 3 is selected, motorists would have to be educated to go from downtown Roanoke to Towers Shopping Mall and take the McClannahan Exit instead of the Wonju Exit. He added that traffic using 23rd Street is subjected to speed bumps turning traffic into and out of Towers Mall, and inquired as to how many lanes are proposed for 23rd Street under Alternate 3; whereupon, Mr. Peery stated that Alternate 3 would not address anything along 23rd Street, except turn lanes at the signal light intersection with Brandon Avenue and entrance adjustments that would be necessary along Colonial Avenue.

Council Member McDaniel stated that Alternate 3 should be tried before spending millions of dollars on Alternates 1 and 2.

Gary Rappaport, owner of Towers Shopping Mall, stated that the shopping center plans to remain in the area for another 20 years and expressed his commitment to Alternate 3. He advised that there may be certain concerns about traffic patterns along 23rd Street, but removing backed-up traffic from U. S. Route 220 (I-581) is important, Alternate 3 would solve the problem, and he would work with VDOT with regard to the necessary right-of-way dedication. He added that opening of the Fresh Market was an example of the long term commitment by Towers Shopping Mall to the City of Roanoke, and it is hoped that the Fresh Market will draw more tenants to existing vacant space at Towers Mall.

Mayor Harris stated that a resolution to traffic congestion on the off ramp from U. S. Route 220 is desperately needed; and the signal light at 23rd Street and Brandon Avenue is significant. He added that a formal recommendation will be made to Council on Monday, October 17, 2005, and every effort has been made to disseminate information to various organizations and private and commercial sectors for review and input prior to the time that Council will make a decision.

The City Manager stated that during her six-year tenure with the City of Roanoke, several major projects have taken place and the working relationship with VDOT has significantly improved. She expressed appreciation for the sensitivity that VDOT has shown to this major commercial area of the City which is an economic development generator.

TAXES: The Director of Finance advised that in 1998, the General Assembly enacted the Personal Property Tax Relief Act (PPTRA or the Act), which provided relief from personal property taxes otherwise payable on the first \$20,000.00 of value for qualifying vehicles; the relief was provided for vehicles owned by individuals and utilized for personal use; additionally, vehicles with an assessed value of \$1,000.00, or less, receive 100 per cent relief; relief is provided by the Commonwealth of Virginia through payments to localities of amounts which would otherwise be taxed to citizens; the original intent of the Act was to phase-in tax relief such that the Commonwealth would ultimately cover the full cost of personal property tax of the eligible vehicles; the Commonwealth's plan of implementing the tax was dependent upon growth in State revenues sufficient to cover the increasing annual cost; currently the Commonwealth of Virginia provides 70 per cent relief on qualifying vehicles and the amount of relief provided by the Commonwealth has been at this level for several years.

Ann Shawver, Deputy Director of Finance, advised that in 2004 and 2005, additional legislation was passed to amend the original Act; the legislation capped PPTRA at \$950 million for all Virginia localities for tax years 2006 and beyond; PPTRA funds will be allocated to individual localities based on each government's pro rata share of tax year 2004 payments from the Commonwealth; and funding for delinquencies of current and past years will continue until September 2006, or until the funding for such is exhausted. She explained that the legislation also altered the timing of payments from the Commonwealth to localities; the impact is dependent on the due date observed by the locality; and for spring billers like Roanoke, the impact is the delay of approximately two months in receipt of the majority of funding provided by the Commonwealth.

It was noted that localities have certain options on how to administer the amended PPTRA, which include the method of apportioning relief to individual taxpayers, flexibility in determining the distribution of relief, and an option to "balance bill" delinquent taxpayers at the end of the current program; to determine the best course of action for the City of Roanoke, a Study Team was formed consisting of representatives from the Offices of the Commissioner of the Revenue, Treasurer, City Attorney and the Department of Finance; and through the course of work on PPTRA revisions, the Study Team consulted with representatives from other localities throughout the State, most notably those from neighboring jurisdictions.

It was explained that two relief methods are available regarding distribution of tax relief – the reduced rate method and the specific relief method; the reduced rate method would involve major changes to administration of the tax including the use of multiple tax rates, one of which would require an annual modification by Council, would bring about more significant changes to citizens and would be more costly to implement than the specific relief method.

It was further explained that the specific relief method, which the Study Team recommends, calls for a percentage of relief to be applied to qualifying vehicles, similar to the method currently used; while the percentage of relief will decline annually assuming growth in the assessed value of personal property, the taxpayer will receive a personal property bill which is more consistent with the type of bill currently utilized; and the specific relief method is fairly efficient and effective to implement since it uses a tax method most consistent with the method currently used.

The Director of Finance advised that localities also have an option as to how they choose to distribute the tax relief once the new program is in place; relief must be provided for owners of qualifying vehicles of \$20,000.00 and less, but changes can be made in how relief is provided for values up to \$20,000.00; in order to maintain consistency with the current PPTRA, the Study Team recommends that relief continue to be applied in a manner similar to the present method which provides that vehicles valued at \$1,000.00 and less continue to remain fully exempt and that relief for vehicles with assessed values ranging from \$1,001.00 to \$20,000.00 continue to be taxed by applying a single common percentage to determine the amount to be paid by the taxpayer. He explained that the final option for localities concerns the ability to balance-bill delinquent taxpayers in full for personal property taxes not remitted by the

September 2006 deadline, or exhaustion of State funding for the current program; this option is available to ensure the opportunity for localities to receive funds from citizens that may have otherwise been paid by the Commonwealth to maximize collections of the tax; and the Study Team is recommending that the City balance-bill any citizens with unpaid taxes once funding from the Commonwealth is exhausted.

In summary, the Director of Finance advised that the recommendations of the Study Team maintain the provisions of the PPTRA most closely with those originally implemented by the Commonwealth, are the most equitable for Roanoke's citizens, are the most efficient and cost-effective for the City to implement, and are consistent with those planned by the majority of other localities in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

The Director of Finance advised that the City of Salem and Roanoke County will recommend similar actions to their respective Council/Board of Supervisors for adoption.

Council Member Lea inquired if the recommendation is the best method for the citizens of Roanoke; whereupon, the Director of Finance stated that the recommendation poses the least hardship on the taxpayer.

The Commissioner of the Revenue added that the State allowed only two options - the reduced rate method and the specific relief method.

Evelyn Powers, City Treasurer, advised that information will be provided all to taxpayers advising of changes to the PPTRA legislation.

There being no further discussion and without objection by Council, the Mayor advised that the recommendation of the Director of Finance would be referred to the City Attorney for preparation of the proper measure for consideration by Council at a future Council meeting.

At 12:00 p.m., the Mayor declared the meeting in recess for a joint session of Council and the Roanoke Redevelopment and Housing Authority.

At 12:00 p.m., on Monday, October 3, 2005, the Council meeting reconvened in the Emergency Operations Center Conference Room, Room 159, Noel C. Taylor Municipal Building, 215 Church Avenue, S. W., the City of Roanoke, for a joint meeting of Council and the Roanoke Redevelopment and Housing Authority, with Mayor Harris and Chairman Fink presiding.

PRESENT: Council Members Brenda L. McDaniel, M. Rupert Cutler, Beverly T. Fitzpatrick, Jr., Sherman P. Lea, Brian J. Wishneff and Mayor C. Nelson Harris-----6.

ABSENT: Council Member Alfred T. Dowe, Jr. -----1.

ROANOKE REDEVELOPMENT AND HOUSING AUTHORITY COMMISSIONERS
PRESENT: James A. Allen, Gregory M. Cupka, Anita M. Powell, Christie L. Wills and Chairman Ben J. Fink -----5.

ABSENT: Commissioner Gregory W. Feldmann -----1.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Representing the City of Roanoke: Darlene L. Burcham, City Manager; William M. Hackworth, City Attorney; Jesse A. Hall, Director of Finance; and Mary F. Parker, City Clerk.

Representing the Roanoke Redevelopment and Housing Authority: John P. Baker, Executive Director; Earl B. Reynolds, Jr., Deputy Executive Director; and Sue Marie Worline, Secretary.

COUNCIL-HOUSING/AUTHORITY: The Mayor welcomed Commissioners and staff of the Roanoke Redevelopment and Housing Authority.

Following lunch, Chairman Fink advised that:

- City Council and the City Administration have placed an unprecedented emphasis on housing and neighborhoods in Roanoke; City Council established a public policy to focus Community Development Block Grants in targeted neighborhoods and the City Administration has established priority neighborhoods in which funds have been focused; and the City Administration has also made clear the desire to have more upscale housing in the City, and has developed a Strategic Housing Plan that will establish a housing and neighborhood roadmap to guide the City, other agencies, non-profits, and private developers.
- City Council established the Roanoke Redevelopment and Housing Authority (RRHA) to be its agent to implement housing and community development programs; in order to get the greatest benefit from implementing public/private partnerships to create new housing and to revitalize existing neighborhoods, it is essential that the City and RRHA have the strongest possible partnership, and it is also in the best interests of the citizens of Roanoke.

- The RRHA is a public entity and shares the same vision as the City of Roanoke to improve or develop housing in the City, to strengthen City neighborhoods and to provide the greatest diversity in housing; the General Assembly has assigned certain powers to the RRHA to implement housing and community development programs; and City Council appoints members of the Board, and no other housing entity has a Board appointed by City Council or the legislative authority to collaborate with the private sector to enhance the marketability and value of residential, commercial and industrial properties.
- The RRHA has more experience in developing and operating housing in the City than any other entity routinely receiving money for housing from the City; in the past several years, the Executive Director and Housing Authority staff have developed a reputation as a successful, strong, efficient, creative organization that collaborates well with others, and have been successful with difficult projects that were important to the City.
- The RRHA has been a strong partner in assisting the City in recycling blighted and underutilized land in the City for economic development, especially the Riverside Centre, and the RRHA understands what it takes to help make the City stronger.
- The RRHA has a better understanding of housing issues than any other entity within the City of Roanoke; by being an owner and on-site manager of housing for low-income families as well as a developer, the Housing Authority understands both the social and the business side of housing.
- The RRHA has developed progressive policies for housing to increase the wealth of low-income families and to improve services to help families become self-sufficient; through collaboration of the Executive Director and staff, a Self-Sufficiency Consortium has brought together major service delivery agencies to better coordinate services.

- The RRHA has a strong desire to be the leading partner with the City to implement the City's vision for housing and neighborhoods and the Comprehensive Plan.
- The RRHA has an outstanding staff that has a tremendous amount of experience in all aspects of housing, services, financing, construction, rehabilitation, management, property assembly, implementation planning, collaboration and an understanding of the City's vision.
- The RRHA has demonstrated a commitment to the City by developing a range of housing, including quality public housing, private low-income housing tax credit (LIHTC) projects, homes for sale, market-rate rental housing in downtown and rehabilitation financing for existing property owners; the RRHA has partnered with the City to take on the Day Avenue Project, a substantial rehabilitation task that has tremendous significance to the downtown area.
- The RRHA has been successful in putting together public/private financing for development and rehabilitation and is respected by banks and tax equity firms for its successful record.
- The Board of Commissioners has been working with City Council and City staff over an extended period of time to improve relations with the City.
- In order to improve and strengthen the partnership with the City, the Board of Commissioners has in place a Memorandum of Understanding between the City and the RRHA, to which it is committed.
- Additionally, the Board of Commissioners has made a commitment to relocate the RRHA's offices to downtown Roanoke to better coordinate with City staff, in particular Planning, Economic Development and Neighborhoods to provide better dialogue and to be more effective as a total organization; and the City Manager and RRHA's Executive Director have worked to develop a plan that will come to fruition in the near future.

- To effect better communications and interactions, City staff and RRHA need to develop a joint operational plan for community development and housing ("Joint Plan"); in particular, with the recent hiring of the City's new Director of Neighborhoods and Housing, combining the Planning Department and Economic Development, and the retirement of the Housing Authority Executive Director in 2006, this takes on even greater importance to be done sooner rather than later.
- As part of the move downtown, it is imperative that the RRHA "Team" stay together; the Executive Director and staff have worked long and hard to break down the "silos" that existed within the RRHA prior to the hiring of Mr. Baker; and there is a need to ensure that none of the hard work is undone by the move to downtown.
- There is a need to ensure that the RRHA maintains a separate identity within the community; comments have been expressed from the community that the RRHA will become "just another department within the City".

The Mayor emphasized the abovereferenced suggestions by Chairman Fink; i.e.: Joint Operational Plan and the need by the Housing Authority to maintain its identity upon relocation to the Municipal Complex.

Vice-Mayor Fitzpatrick advised that Council has tried to create a better relationship between the RRHA and the City of Roanoke; and the Operational Agreement is long overdue. He stated that the City can receive assistance as a result of the Housing Authority's expertise in housing; and as an example, he called attention to the Villages at Lincoln project which contains 145 less low-income housing units due to revitalization and construction of new homes in the area. Secondly, he called attention to the identity issue and a question as to the best way to address the matter in a building that has security issues, i.e.: ADA concerns in terms of creating a separate entrance. He stated that he supported having the right kind of identity so that citizens in need of services will have easy access to the Housing Authority's office, and suggested that Council and City staff respond to the suggestions offered by Chairman Fink on behalf of the RRHA.

Council Member Cutler expressed appreciation to the RRHA for the quality of work in southeast Roanoke, the Hope VI Project, the South Jefferson Redevelopment project, and the Eight North Jefferson Place project. With respect to the issue of a separate identity, he stated that some type of creative signage could be installed in the Lobby of Municipal South. He inquired if the entire RRHA management team would be housed in Municipal North; whereupon, it was stated that the RRHA plans to include all staff in the relocation.

Council Member Lea expressed appreciation to Mr. Baker for his service and called attention to the importance of a partnership between the City of Roanoke and the Housing Authority as both entities focus on housing. As a former Commissioner of the Redevelopment and Housing Authority in Danville, Virginia, Council Member Lea stressed the importance of maintaining the identity of the RRHA, and suggested that Council work toward ensuring that the Housing Authority's identity is maintained, especially for the benefit of Roanoke's citizens.

There being no further discussion and without objection by Council, the Mayor advised that the question of a joint operational plan for the City and the RRHA would be referred to the City Manager and to the Executive Director for report to the Council and to the RRHA in 60 – 90 days, and that the identity issue would be addressed as a part of the joint operational plan.

HOUSING/AUTHORITY-PLANNING: The City Manager advised that the final report with regard to the City's Strategic Housing Plan was received on Friday, September 30, 2005; and both the Housing Authority and City Administration are well versed in their respective roles and responsibilities. She stated that the City Planning Commission will hold a public hearing on October 20, 2005, to approve the Housing Strategic Plan and forward the document to Council for consideration on Monday, December 19, 2005.

Chairman Fink stated that the Board of Commissioners would like for the Strategic Housing Plan to be included as a part of the joint operational plan of the City and the RRHA.

Vice-Mayor Fitzpatrick suggested that a copy of the Housing Strategic Plan be forwarded to the Board of Commissioners of the Housing Authority.

Council Member Cutler inquired about the Virginia Railroad Station and the stables located between Jefferson Street and Williamson Road; whereupon, the Executive Director advised that the Housing Authority continues to work with various organizations to preserve the former railroad station, however, funds received to date are insufficient to address major renovations; and although the Housing Authority does not own the stables, it has taken appropriate actions to ensure that the building remains intact.

Council Member Wishneff inquired about the availability of housing for displaced families affected by the recent hurricanes; whereupon, it was advised that HUD has contacted housing authority agencies throughout the country to inquire about vacancies in public housing complexes, and the RRHA has a policy that it will assist any person who resided in public housing in the New Orleans area who was displaced as a result of the two recent hurricanes. The City Manager added that local non-profit organizations are making arrangements for displaced families and individuals to relocate to the City of Roanoke, and upon arrival, the non-profit organizations have committed to a six-month period of assistance.

Mr. Allen called attention to Section I of the Memorandum of Understanding between the Board of Commissioners of the RRHA and the Council of the City of Roanoke: A strong partnership between the City and the Housing Authority is essential to the success of the overall mission of both. The unique powers and roles, when combined in a working partnership, provide the greatest opportunity for addressing the challenging issues facing Roanoke today." He stated that it is hoped that the Council and the RRHA will work together to improve the relationship with the citizens of Roanoke.

On behalf of the Council, the Mayor expressed appreciation to the Board of Commissioners of the Roanoke Redevelopment and Housing Authority for their service to the citizens of the City of Roanoke.

At 12:55 p.m., the Mayor declared the City Council meeting in recess until 2:00 p.m., in the City Council Chamber and Chairman Fink declared the meeting of the RRHA in recess.

Council reconvened at 1:35 p.m., in the Council's Conference Room, Room 451, Noel C. Taylor Municipal Building, with all Members of the Council in attendance, except Council Member Dowe, Mayor Harris presiding, for the following staff briefing.

HERSHBERGER ROAD/ORANGE AVENUE/I-581 CORRIDOR LANDSCAPE INITIATIVES: Robert K. Bengtson, Director of Public Works, called upon Dwayne D'Ardenne, Landscape Supervisor, Department of Parks and Recreation, for a briefing on landscape initiatives for the Orange Avenue/I-581 intersection and the Hershberger Road corridor.

Mr. D'Ardenne advised that:

Orange Avenue/I-81 Interchange Conceptual Landscape Master Plan

The conceptual Landscape Master Plan for Orange Avenue/I-581 Interchange from Gainsboro Road east to Williamson Road includes three focuses: improved gateway aesthetics, a layered plant design that provides four seasons of color and interest while remaining maintenance friendly, and an opportunity for corporate and/or private partnership or investment.

Improved Gateway Aesthetics:

The City's Vision Comprehensive Plan specifically speaks to "beautifying our important gateway corridors" and the Orange Avenue/I-581 Interchange is a significant gateway to the City. Whether one is headed to an event at the Roanoke Civic Center, or headed east on Route 460 to Williamson Road, or the Roanoke Centre for Industry and Technology, or west to the City's School Administration Building, or Washington Park, the interchange could be characterized as the City's gateway to local culture, education and commerce.

Layered Plant Design:

The layered plant design concept ensures multi-season interest to any landscape whether it be a residential backyard or a municipal transportation corridor. Natural areas, be they woodlands or rainforests, inherently possess many layers and the City's design follows nature's lead. The Master Plan builds upon the established "Gray Infrastructure" base layer of asphalt and concrete. The City's Landscape Design's "Green Infrastructure" begins with turfgrass as the canvas upon which to then "paint" with layers of perennials and bulbs, small and large flowering shrubs, small flowering trees and large deciduous and evergreen trees.

In contrast to Hershberger Road, traffic patterns and already visually cluttered scale of the Orange Avenue/I-581 Interchange lends itself to the more compact layers of flowering trees, shrubs, perennials/bulbs and turfgrass.

Opportunity for corporate and/or private partnership or investment:

With Governor Warner's expected signature, State Senate Bill 1260 will officially allow signage on State-owned right-of-way recognizing corporate/private donors. The bill effectively formalizes a process by which the State would give local governments permission to follow what the Cities of Danville and Lynchburg have already accomplished using the public/private partnership approach to beautifying their gateway corridors.

Orange Avenue/I-581 Master Plan Project concepts:

1. Six-layered landscape slopes:

Each sloped area within each of the four cloverleaves are planted to best take advantage of traffic sightlines and mowing challenges

Plant layers begin with turfgrass canvas and add perennials/bulbs, small flowering shrubs, large flowering shrubs, small flowering trees and finally large evergreen trees to provide winter structure

2. Civic Center and School Administration properties:

Both Civic Center and School Administration slopes receive landscaping to improve facades and first impressions as visitors exit I-581

VDOT's limited access fencelines along both of these properties will also be replaced or revamped at these locations, as well as the First Baptist Church Cemetery location adjacent to the northeast cloverleaf

3. Opportunities for private and/or commercial partnership and investment:

Any or all of the layered planting areas in this design are potential opportunities of private and/or commercial partnerships

Round figure estimates of the Orange Avenue/I-581 Interchange Landscape Master Plan as currently conceptualized:

256 trees (one fourth of Hershberger Road)
 3000 shrubs (same as Hershberger Road)
 60,000 perennials/bulbs (1.5 X Hershberger Road)
 Six acres of turfgrass renovation/re-establishment
 Construction Costs - \$500,000.00 (excluding finalized designs, bid/construction documents or contract administration)
 Annual contracted maintenance costs - \$30,000.00 - \$40,000.00 per year

Project Details:

Hershberger Road maintenance estimated total - \$9,000.00 - \$11,000.00 X 8.5 months = \$77,000.00 - \$94,000.00
 Plantings - three man crew X three days two X per month = \$5,000.00 - \$6,000.00 per month
 Mowing - currently pay \$785.00 - (No VDOT ROW) = \$4,000.00 - \$5,000.00 per month

Orange Avenue/I-581 Maintenance - Total \$29,000.00 to \$34,000.00 per year
 Plantings - three man crew X 1.5 days X \$2,000.00 per month = \$2,500.00 - \$3,000.00 per month X 8.5 months = \$21,250.00 - \$25,500.00
 Mowing - Estimated four man hours X four hours X \$25.00 per man hour = \$500.00 every two weeks = \$8,500.00

Hershberger Road N. W. Conceptual Landscape Master Plan

The Conceptual Landscape Master Plan for Hershberger Road, N. W., from Cove Road east to Williamson Road includes three focuses: improved gateway aesthetics, layered plant design that provides four seasons of color and interest while remaining maintenance friendly, and opportunity for corporate and/or private partnership or investment.

Improved Gateway Aesthetics:

The City's Vision Comprehensive Plan specifically speaks to "beautifying our important gateway corridors" and Hershberger Road is arguably one of, if not the most, important gate of the City. Whether it be prospective business travelers arriving at the airport for the first time or shoppers to any of the significant commercial/retail destinations of Valley View Mall, Crossroads Mall, Towne Square/Sam's Club, Lowe's/Home Depot complexes, or further on to Williamson or Peters Creek Roads, Hershberger Road is a very important first impression of the City, the Roanoke Valley and the greater New Virginia region.

Layered Plant Design:

The layered plant design concept ensures multi-season interest to any landscape, whether it be a residential backyard or a municipal transportation corridor. Natural areas, be they woodlands or rainforests, inherently possess many layers and the design follows nature's lead. The Master Plan builds upon the established "Gray Infrastructure" base layer of asphalt and concrete. The City's Landscape Design's "Green Infrastructure" begins with turfgrass as the canvas upon which to then "paint" with layers of perennials and bulbs, small and large flowering shrubs, small flowering trees and finally, large deciduous and evergreen trees.

The wide-open scale of the Hershberger Road corridor begs for bold landscape design and large scale trees, but should not eliminate the "Valley View" of spectacular sunsets every evening as the sun sets behind the mountain range peaks visible to the west.

Opportunity for corporate and/or private partnership or investment:

With Governor Warner's expected signature, State Senate Bill 1260 will officially allow signage on State owned right-of-way recognizing corporate/private donors. This bill effectively formalizes a process by which the State would give local governments permission to follow what the Cities of Danville and Lynchburg have already accomplished using the public/private partnership approach to beautifying their gateway corridors.

Hershberger Road, N. W. Landscape Master Plan Project concepts:

1. Four layered landscape islands in medians.
13 median islands from Ordway Drive east to Grandview Avenue
Each island will be 125' long, having 175' of turfgrass canvas between the islands
Island plant layers will begin with turfgrass and add perennials and bulbs, flowering shrubs and Crape Myrtles
2. Allée of trees focus and define the corridor:
Trees planted Allée style between street light poles which help focus one's eye into the center median islands while still allowing street light penetration to the pavement and allowing views to the west of spectacular "Valley View" sunsets.
Additional trees are proposed along private property continuing the Allée theme where existing right-of-way is insufficient to allow planting on City property
3. Hershberger Road/I-581 cloverleaves:
Focus on reforestation will provide more than 500 large shade trees
Renovate difficult to maintain slopes with Hard Fescue and/or remove invasives from existing Crown Vetch
4. Opportunities for private/or commercial partnership and investment
More than a dozen locations have been identified and designed as opportunity areas for private and/or commercial partnership and investment
Locations incorporate four to six plant layers (depending on location and terrain) and vary in size and visibility. Six layer islands would include the following – turfgrass canvas, bulbs/perennials, small flowering shrubs, late flowering shrubs, small flowering trees, and large deciduous/evergreen trees

Round figure estimates for the Hershberger Road Landscape Master Plan as currently conceptualized:

1000 trees
 3000 shrubs
 40,000 perennials/bulbs
 20+ acres of turfgrass renovation/reestablishment
 Construction costs - \$1 million (excluding finalized designs, bid/construction documents or contract administration)
 Annual contracted maintenance costs - \$75,000.00 - \$95,000.00 per year

Council Member Cutler inquired if the concept will be consistent with new State laws and/or VDOT regulations; whereupon, Mr. D'Ardenne responded in the affirmative. He advised that regulations will take effect on December 1, 2005, and inasmuch as the City of Roanoke was chosen as one of two pilot locations in the Commonwealth of Virginia, plans may proceed prior to December 1.

Council Member Cutler inquired about the definition of "pilot" and whether or not serving as a "pilot project" gives the locality the authority to proceed. He also inquired as to the availability of State funding. Mr. D'Ardenne advised that no State funds are available and estimated that the cost of the project, excluding administrative or design fees, will be approximately \$500,000.00.

Mr. Bengtson advised that minimal requirements of the proposed regulations would be an added barricade interchange, participants would be required to contribute at least \$20,000.00, and there is an opportunity for two participants per quadrant.

Council Member Cutler inquired about the cost of maintenance; whereupon, Mr. Bengtson advised that due to the current workload of City crews, maintenance responsibility for upkeep of both plans would have to be outsourced.

Inasmuch as the projects will become community assets, Vice-Mayor Fitzpatrick suggested that an annual maintenance cost for upkeep be included when soliciting funds from private sources.

The City Manager explained that the two landscape designs represent initial steps to identify partners for the projects and it was the desire of staff to brief the Council on landscape initiatives at the early stages of development.

Council Member McDaniel inquired if signs identifying participants in landscape design projects will be uniform; whereupon, Mr. D'Ardenne advised that VDOT guidelines impose certain regulations with regard to signage.

Mr. Bengtson advised that a briefing with regard to the City's long range plan initiative will be presented at the Council's November 7 work session. The City Manager added that as a part of the Council briefing, staff will recommend specific actions for use of VDOT funds to enhance interchanges and to prioritize funds received from VDOT, rather than wait for funds to be received from private sources.

Vice-Mayor Fitzpatrick advised that unless the General Assembly makes a dramatic change in highway transportation dollars, the City of Roanoke will receive no funds for new projects after the year 2010. He added that this may be the appropriate time for the City to use funds received from VDOT toward a beautification project on Hershberger Road at I-581. He requested that the City contact the appropriate State office to inquire if the fence located off I-581 near the intersection of Wells Avenue and Williamson Road could be relocated parallel to the interstate and that the property be donated to the City for landscaping purposes. He noted that the City's logo, or the Star, could be engraved in the landscape to create a vision that could be seen by motorists traveling to The Hotel Roanoke or from the downtown area and the cost could be covered through donations.

Council Member Cutler called attention to the intersection at Williamson Road and Wells Avenue at the new bridge which includes the Lick Run Greenway, and requested that the area be cleaned up for the benefit of those persons using the Lick Run Greenway.

At 1:55 p.m., the Mayor declared the Council meeting in recess until 2:00 p.m., in the City Council Chamber.

At 2:00 p.m., on Monday, October 3, 2005, the Council meeting reconvened in the City Council Chamber, Room 450, Noel C. Taylor Municipal Building, 215 Church Avenue, S. W., City of Roanoke, Virginia, with Mayor C. Nelson Harris presiding.

PRESENT: Council Members Brenda L. McDaniel, Brian J. Wishneff, M. Rupert Cutler, Alfred T. Dowe, Jr. (arrived late), Beverly T. Fitzpatrick, Jr., Sherman P. Lea and Mayor C. Nelson Harris -----7.

ABSENT: None -----0.

The Mayor declared the existence of a quorum.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Darlene L. Burcham, City Manager; William M. Hackworth, City Attorney; Jesse A. Hall, Director of Finance; and Mary F. Parker, City Clerk.

The invocation was delivered by Vice-Mayor Beverly T. Fitzpatrick, Jr.

The Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America was led by Mayor Harris.

PRESENTATIONS AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

CITY EMPLOYEES-SCHOOLS: The Mayor advised that in conjunction with the Roanoke City Public Schools Adult and Continuing Education Office, the City of Roanoke participated in the Governor's "Race to GED" program; an information session was held during the latter part of April, and as a result of the meeting, eight City employees expressed an interest in pursuing their GED; and all costs associated with the Program were provided through grant funds from the State of Virginia Department of Education.

The Mayor recognized Elliot Doyle, Maintenance Mechanic, Transportation Department, Streets and Traffic Division, an 18 year employee of the City; and Lawrence Taylor, Maintenance Supervisor, Fleet Management Department, a 33 year City employee, for successfully completing the requirements of the GED Program. He presented each with City sponsored gift cards from Wal-Mart, in the amount of \$50.00 and engraved plaques.

The Mayor advised that Roanoke City Public Schools will continue to offer the GED review and English as a Second Language classes through continuing education at Breckenridge, Jackson and Woodrow Wilson Middle Schools.

PROCLAMATIONS-HEALTH DEPARTMENT: The Mayor presented a proclamation to Charles Wohlford, President, National Alliance for the Mentally Ill, Roanoke Valley, declaring Sunday, October 2, 2005, as Mental Illness Awareness Week.

PROCLAMATIONS-FIRE DEPARTMENT: The Mayor presented a proclamation to Acting Fire/EMS Chief David Hoback declaring October 9 - 15, 2005, as Fire Prevention Week.

PROCLAMATIONS-POLICE DEPARTMENT: The Mayor presented a proclamation to Police Chief Atlas L. "Joe" Gaskins declaring October 2005, as Crime Prevention Month.

PROCLAMATIONS-POLICE DEPARTMENT: The Mayor presented a proclamation to Police Chief Atlas L. "Joe" Gaskins declaring October 2005, as Domestic Violence Awareness Month.

Council Member Lea advised that at the Council meeting on Monday, September 19, 2005, the City Manager was encouraged to appoint a Task Force to review the issue of domestic violence prevention in the City of Roanoke. He reported that a planning meeting was held last week which was attended by the City Manager, the Assistant City Manager for Community Development, the Chief of Police and other persons from the community; and the group discussed the fact that currently there are numerous services and programs available for the victims of domestic violence, but there is a tremendous need to disseminate information to and within the community, to appoint a Task Force, and to close existing gaps with regard to domestic violence. He further stated that another meeting has been scheduled and will be attended by representatives of the Family Violence Coordinating Council, and it is anticipated that a progress report will be submitted to the Council in the near future. He expressed appreciation to the Members of Council for their support of the appointment of a Task Force on Domestic Violence.

PROCLAMATIONS-DISABLED PERSONS: The Mayor presented a proclamation to Ken Rush, Employment Subcommittee Chair, Mayor's Committee for People with Disabilities, declaring October 2005, as National Disability Employment Awareness Month.

Council Member Dowe entered the meeting.

CONSENT AGENDA

The Mayor advised that all matters listed under the Consent Agenda were considered to be routine by the Members of Council and would be enacted by one motion in the form, or forms, listed on the Consent Agenda, and if discussion was desired, the item would be removed from the Consent Agenda and considered separately.

OATHS OF OFFICE-COMMITTEES-ROANOKE ARTS COMMISSION-HUMAN DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE-LIBRARIES: A report of qualification of the following persons, was before Council:

Wyona M. Lynch-McWhite as a member of the Roanoke Arts Commission, for a term ending June 30, 2008;

Gail Burruss as a member of the Human Services Advisory Board, for a term ending November 30, 2008;

Stanley G. Breakell and Pamela S. White as members of the Roanoke Public Library Board, for terms ending June 30, 2008; and

Harold H. Worrell, Sr., as a member of the War Memorial Committee, for a term ending June 30, 2007.

Vice-Mayor Fitzpatrick moved that the report of qualification be received and filed. The motion was seconded by Council Member Dowe and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members McDaniel, Wishneff, Cutler, Dowe, Fitzpatrick, Lea and Mayor Harris-----7.

NAYS: None-----0.

REGULAR AGENDA

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

CITY PROPERTY-PARKING FACILITIES: Pursuant to instructions by the Council, the City Clerk having advertised a public hearing for Monday, October 3, 2005, at 2:00 p.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, on the conveyance of certain City-owned property located on Salem Avenue and Norfolk Avenue, S. W., to the Times World Corporation, in exchange for certain property owned by the Times World Corporation located on Campbell Avenue, S. W., in connection with future development of a downtown parking garage, the matter was before body.

Legal advertisement of the public hearing was published in *The Roanoke Times* on Friday, September 23, 2005.

The City Manager submitted a communication advising that the City owns property located on Salem Avenue, S. W., which is currently used for parking of official vehicles; the City wishes to convey the property to *The Roanoke Times* in exchange for a parcel of land located on Campbell Avenue, S. W., containing approximately 0.422 acre, identified as Official Tax No. 1010829, which is owned by the Times World Corporation; the parcel of land will be used for future development of a downtown parking garage; and property to be conveyed by the City of Roanoke is identified as a new Tax Map No. 1010106, containing approximately 0.467 acre, defined as Lot 5A.

It was further advised that on August 15, 2005, Council adopted Ordinance No. 37163-081505, which authorized conveyance of a 0.449 acre parcel known as Parcel 1-A, bearing Official Tax No. 1010107; the plat was subsequently revised changing the name of the parcel of land to be conveyed to Parcel 5A; and a new Tax Map No. 1010106 has been assigned to Lot 5A.

The City Manager recommended that she be authorized to execute a deed of exchange to convey the property designated as Parcel 5A, Tax Map No. 1010106, containing approximately 0.467 acre as shown on the Plat of Street Vacation, Subdivision and Combination made for City of Roanoke, Virginia, dated August 26, 2005, to *The Roanoke Times*, in exchange for a parcel of land identified as Official Tax No. 1010829 and that Council repeal Ordinance No. 37163-081505, subject to approval as to form by the City Attorney.

Vice-Mayor Fitzpatrick offered the following ordinance:

(#37195-100305) AN ORDINANCE authorizing the City Manager to execute the necessary documents providing for the conveyance of a 0.467 acre parcel of City-owned property known as Parcel 5A, identified as new Official Tax No. 1010106, located on Salem Avenue, S. W., to the Times-World Corporation in exchange for a 0.422 acre parcel bearing Official Tax No. 1010829, located on Campbell Avenue, S. W., for development of a downtown parking garage, upon certain terms and conditions; and repealing Ordinance No. 37173-081505, in order to provide for a revised description of the property being conveyed to the Times-World Corporation; and dispensing with the second reading of this ordinance.

(For full text of ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 70, Page 1.)

Vice-Mayor Fitzpatrick moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 37195-100305. The motion was seconded by Council Member Dowe.

The Mayor inquired if there were persons present who would like to speak in connection with the matter; whereupon, Mr. Robert E. Gravely, 727 29th Street, N. W., spoke with regard to the misuse of land in the City of Roanoke. He referred to the previous expansion of *The Roanoke Times* for the purpose of accommodating a new state-of-the-art printing press and promises by *The Roanoke Times* of the creation of more jobs when, in fact, the Circulation Department was downsized. He expressed concern that citizens were not aware of the exchange of land between the City and *The Roanoke Times* and stated that issues involving the use of taxpayers' money should be discussed in public.

There being no further speakers, the Mayor declared the public hearing closed.

There being no questions or comments by Council Members, Ordinance No. 37195-100305 was adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members McDaniel, Wishneff, Cutler, Dowe, Fitzpatrick, Lea and Mayor Harris-----7.

NAYS: None-----0.

PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS:

ARMORY/STADIUM-HOTEL ROANOKE CONFERENCE CENTER-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: Council Member Wishneff presented a statement with regard to economic development opportunities in the City of Roanoke, ranging from The Hotel Roanoke to Victory Stadium.

He advised that:

- Council will receive the results of the Victory Stadium study in the next 45 days; at that time, Council will receive cost estimates for renovating Victory Stadium and cost estimates for building various size new stadiums; and equally important, Council will receive information about the type and level of usage that stadium options might generate.
- Public discussion during the past several months has been solely about high school football needs and while high school football is a key factor, it is not the only factor.

- There is a belief that with the right type and size stadium, it can also be an important economic development opportunity for the City of Roanoke.
- Since the year 2005 is the tenth anniversary of the reopening of The Hotel Roanoke and Conference Center, it would be helpful to look back at the project and see if there are lessons to be learned for Council's future stadium decision.
- In the early 1990's, he was selected by the City Manager to lead an effort to prepare a financing plan that would allow for complete renovation of The Hotel Roanoke which was a very emotional issue; the public wanted the Hotel saved and renovated; people had vivid, personal memories of The Hotel Roanoke and their emotional feelings was a significant factor for the City administration and City Council in its decisions about how much money the City was willing to contribute to the project.
- For the City administration and for City Council, it was also about numbers and where and how the Hotel's renovation might fit into the overall strategy for improving the financial health of the City.
- Big picture factors that drove the decision-making in the mid-1990's:
 - Virginia is the only state in the country with an independent city system of government; unlike Roanoke's neighbors in North Carolina, cities in Virginia only receive the local tax revenues they collect and there is no automatic sharing of expenses; annexation for cities like Roanoke was eliminated in 1978, so boundaries became frozen; this meant that cities in Virginia wanted to continue to be equal, regional partners in industrial development and recruitment, and given the fixed, limited boundaries, cities had to look elsewhere for additional strategic investments that would bring new tax revenue.

- The number one economic goal in the mid-1990's was to work on projects that had the potential to significantly increase the City's tax collections.
- Within a one hour drive and a 60 mile radius, there are 650,000 people.
- In the mid-1990's, the City of Roanoke was the 15th largest City or County in Virginia; and the other 14 larger communities are located in what is referred to as the "Golden Crescent" along the eastern part of the State.
- Despite Roanoke's relatively small size and the fact that Roanoke is not located in the more affluent "Golden Crescent", the City of Roanoke was number one in the entire State of Virginia in per capita sales tax collections.
- Despite Roanoke's relatively small size and location outside the "Golden Crescent, the City of Roanoke was in the top five in the State for per capita restaurant sales and continued to be a regional draw for people to eat-out.
- In 1996, the City of Roanoke benefited from its role as a regional shopping hub; and because of this, the three fastest growing sources of taxes in the City were meals tax, hotel rooms tax and sales tax.
- Therefore, coming to the conclusion that the re-opening of a renovated Hotel Roanoke should be the City's number one economic development project was easy; and accomplishing the renovation and reopening of a first-class hotel in downtown Roanoke at that time was anything but easy.
- The City hired independent consultants to study the financial feasibility of renovating The Hotel Roanoke and the consultants concluded that it was not financially feasible.

- The consultants advised the City that it needed to create a set of circumstances that would generate more over night business if The Hotel Roanoke were to reopen and the only realistic option available to the City at that time to increase room nights was to increase business from the meetings market, which would be a significant challenge.
- The meetings market was full of competitors, some of which were located in communities with large airports with a great amount of air service and some were located on a beach and/or golf course.
- The City's consultants advised that if Roanoke was to attract a significant amount of new meetings business, it could not downsize The Hotel Roanoke in any significant way; with a full-service hotel with at least 300-400 rooms, meeting planners representing larger groups, such as statewide associations, would come to Roanoke; when The Hotel Roanoke was closed, the next biggest hotel in the Roanoke Valley was the 200-plus room Marriott which is now the Wyndham; and if The Hotel Roanoke were going to be a competitive location for large group meetings business, it had to have at least 300-rooms.
- Therefore, the City had to create or invent a business model that was not obvious to the City at that time and the following was identified for Roanoke:
 - As the largest City in the western part of the state, Roanoke traditionally functioned as the location for statewide associations as they rotated their meetings to different regions of the state; at that time, Roanoke not only lacked a headquarters hotel, but quality and large meeting rooms; therefore, if part of Roanoke's business model was to attract its share of statewide association business, it had to have a quality meeting facility with multiple, large meeting rooms.

- About that time, information surfaced that the Town of Blacksburg and Virginia Tech were in early discussions about building a larger hotel and meeting space complex to replace the Donaldson Brown Center and the proposed location was near downtown Blacksburg; therefore, the City of Roanoke approached Virginia Tech about participating in an off-campus hotel and conference center project in downtown Roanoke, which would involve reusing The Hotel Roanoke.
- Virginia Tech was in between Presidents at that time and early in the spring, Virginia Tech announced that Dr. James McComas, then President of the University of Toledo, would be the next President of Virginia Tech; that summer, a small delegation led by Mayor Noel C. Taylor visited the University of Toledo to explain the City's concept, at which time Dr. McComas advised that the University of Toledo was recently involved in a public-private partnership between the City of Toledo, the University, and a hotel developer in a project that involved a combination hotel, meeting space and continuing education located 20 miles from campus in downtown Toledo.
- Virginia Tech became a major partner with the City of Roanoke in the pursuit of The Hotel Roanoke project.
- The City's consultants studied the impact of bringing Virginia Tech business to the City's business model and concluded that it would add an additional 20 per cent in meetings, business and overnight hotel-room business to Roanoke's model; however, that meant that the City would have to build the type of spaces with a level of technology that would attract users from Virginia Tech.
- In the early 1990's, a typical full-service 332 room hotel like The Hotel Roanoke would have built meeting or conference space as a part of their project of about 10,000 square feet; in order to accommodate the different components of the

meetings market business, the City needed to generate enough new room nights to make renovation of The Hotel Roanoke feasible, therefore, the City proposed building a meeting or hotel and conference facility with over 60,000 square feet of meeting space, which was approximately six times larger than the typical 332 room headquarters hotel could justify.

- The Roanoke Ballroom is the largest of the ballrooms in The Hotel Roanoke and is the largest ballroom west of Richmond in the Commonwealth of Virginia.
- It was necessary for Roanoke to have unmatched, quality spaces with the latest technology if Roanoke was to attract the Virginia Tech component of business; another major partner and potential user at the time was Carillon Health System and rooms that included dual rear-screen projectors was a requirement for health care presenters.
- It was also necessary to have a kind of physical separation for serious users and for those less than serious, rowdier conventioners, thus was borne the idea of placing the small meeting rooms on the lower level of the Conference Center completely out of sight of the ballrooms that were located upstairs.
- Providing the right facilities was only part of the battle; the landscape around the country was littered with failed hotels operated by the private sector which were attached to failed publicly-owned conference centers operated by a public entity; it was known from the negative experience of other places that Roanoke needed a seamless operation between the publicly owned conference center and the privately owned hotel; therefore, the same private sector management group was needed to manage both facilities.
- With all of the effort and significant financial involvement by the City came high expectations; Council asked that a business model be designed that on paper paid for itself; the City was financially responsible for half of the operating deficit in the Conference Center and all of the annual debt service for building the Conference Center; therefore, The Hotel Roanoke and Conference Center would have to generate enough local taxes from within the four walls of the facility to pay the City's annual debt service on the Conference Center and any operating losses.

- Looking back after ten years of history, The Hotel Roanoke has met expectations and projections; Virginia Tech has accounted for 20 per cent of The Hotel's business as projected; the Conference Center is one of the only publicly owned meeting facilities in the country that operates in the black and The Hotel Roanoke enjoys its rightful position as the favorite location for meeting planners booking statewide association business; in addition, direct revenues from the facilities exceed the operating and annual debt service costs and the City collects almost \$2 million in direct City taxes from the complex.
- The question becomes, does Roanoke's experience with The Hotel Roanoke have anything to do with how the stadium question is assessed, and the answer is yes.
- The first lesson is that since Roanoke is not a fast growth area like the Golden Crescents, the City of Roanoke has to work harder and smarter if it wants bigger and higher quality projects like The Hotel Roanoke and Conference Center by studying potential business markets before pursuing economic development projects involving the expenditure of significant City money.
- Another lesson is that when possible, partners should be recruited to help share the risks and rewards, and identify/structure only those projects that play to Roanoke's geographic, natural and man made strengths and assets.
- The more important lesson for the stadium decision that can be learned from The Hotel Roanoke and Conference Center project relates to the Conference Center; in order to make The Hotel financially feasible, Roanoke had to attract a large amount of new over night business related to different segments of the meetings business; and in order to accomplish that, the City had to build a conference center six times bigger than The Hotel Roanoke, by itself, could justify; the City was able to do so and still have one of the only publicly owned conference centers that operates in the black.
- Size will matter when it comes to the success of a stadium project in the City of Roanoke.

- He served as lead consultant for the Carilion Biomedical Institute (CBI) project; there was no serious consideration of a site near Roanoke Memorial Hospital and CBI was moving toward a new Hollins campus located on Interstate-81, midway between Virginia Tech and the University of Virginia.
- Research revealed that biomedical parks that were removed from the hub of healthcare activity and away from key decision makers performed poorly; those near or adjacent to existing university campuses and/or hospital campuses were more successful; and staff persons who were sent to these off-site removed campuses believed that they were missing out on the action and actually resisted moving.
- Population-wise, in 2004, Roanoke City went from the 12th largest to the 18th largest.
- 2004 sales per capita shows that Roanoke continues to be number one in the state among large localities for annual sales tax collected per capita.
- The City of Roanoke has leaped over two large northern Virginia counties to third place in 2004 restaurant sales per capita.
- The City of Roanoke slipped one spot in 2004 hotel sales per capita, falling from ninth to tenth.
- Like ten years ago, Roanoke's hotel, restaurant and retail store base has remained a major tax revenue asset and one that Roanoke must continue to find ways to enhance.
- Enhancing the City of Roanoke's tax base will require different approaches than ten years ago; all 12 of the hotels built in the Roanoke Valley over the past ten years are what are referred to in the hotel industry as limited-service hotels which do little to improve Roanoke's attractiveness to meetings planners to use The Hotel Roanoke and Conference Center.

- While these 1,113 limited service new hotel rooms are not overly attractive for the meetings business, they are the type of hotel facilities that parents of traveling soccer teams or AAU basketball teams or alumni of teams playing in the Stagg Bowl football game like to stay; therefore, Roanoke has a tremendous existing capacity within its hotel, restaurant and retail base to attract events that are sports-related.
- Given the above factors, it is reasonable to conclude that as a part of any strategic efforts to increase tax collections in sales, hotels and meals taxes, the City of Roanoke should pursue sports-related events and games.
- Many other regions around the country also have seen the same opportunity and are developing strategies to proceed; therefore, Roanoke needs to craft plans that provide facilities that differentiate Roanoke from the competition; as with meeting facilities at The Hotel Roanoke, Roanoke needs to work to attract partners and to find ways to provide a better level of customer service than the competition.
- Americans are holding sporting events at all skill levels and ages in unprecedented numbers; if Roanoke is smart in its decision making, it can add facilities that do not duplicate what is already in the Roanoke Valley; for example, there will be some events that are better suited to Salem's 8,000 seat stadium and if Roanoke chooses to renovate Victory Stadium, there will be some events that are better suited to a 20,000 plus seat stadium.
- Roanoke has 19 colleges and universities within a 60 mile radius and not many regions the size of Roanoke can make that boast.
- Slides were presented of neutral stadiums east of the Mississippi River that have stadiums as large or larger than Victory Stadium; Greensboro expanded its basketball arena in large part so that it could have a neutral basketball court large enough to periodically host the Men's ACC basketball tournament.

- An ACC official in charge of selecting locations to host league tournaments for sports, other than football and basketball, advised that current ACC league policy for sports such as soccer and lacrosse is to select neutral stadiums for championship tournaments; and there is a shortage of good neutral stadiums to host championship events.
- When City leaders built Victory Stadium in 1941 and decided to make the facility a 24,000 seat venue, they built the stadium, for more than high school football; in 1941, it was most likely one of the largest stadiums in Virginia and according to newspaper accounts, it was built that large for economic development reasons; Roanoke hosted a football game between VMI and the Citadel and later between the University of Virginia and Virginia Tech; the City of Lynchburg was building a new stadium and Roanoke City leaders built Victory Stadium at 24,000 seats to keep Lynchburg from stealing those games; and an economic opportunity vision drove community leaders 64 years ago to build a 24,000 seat facility.
- Roanoke already has the beginning of an outdoor sports campus with the River's Edge Sports complex and Victory Stadium.
- Roanoke's sports complex would be in close proximity to the largest hospital in Virginia west of Charlottesville and across the street from the biomedical park and there could be an opportunity to partner with Carilion Biomedical Institute on a unique set of facilities and activities related to sports medicine.
- The City of Roanoke has additional economic development opportunities and assets to build upon; i.e.:
 - The need to identify development to take advantage of the uniqueness of having a mountain located within City boundaries
 - The need to craft a master plan that both honors and takes advantage of the many famous people who have lived and/or worked in historic Gainsboro

- The need to recognize that Roanoke already has a location for a first-class, outdoor amphitheater with ample existing parking in the evenings and on weekends and its location can be another activity that helps drive businesses into the downtown
- The need to develop a plan to build upon the success of The Hotel Roanoke and Conference Center through construction of more exhibit and meeting space at The Hotel, in an effort to leverage meeting space and additional parking spaces to recruit a developer that would add at least 100 additional hotel rooms on site

In closing, Council Member Wishneff advised that there are some voices in the community that say a 20,000 plus seat stadium is too large for Roanoke, but those voices represent a short-sighted, conservative and myopic view, they belittle the City's capability to successfully develop and market a larger stadium, and the same voices say things like the days of VMI and the Citadel playing football in Victory Stadium and marching up Jefferson Street are over. He further advised that had those same voices been around in the mid 1990's when the City of Roanoke was contemplating whether to renovate The Hotel Roanoke, they most likely would have said Roanoke cannot support such a large hotel and conference center because the days of hotel guests arriving by train are over and Norfolk Southern has moved its annual meetings out of Roanoke; however, fortunately such shortsighted thinking was nowhere to be found ten years ago.

Mr. Robert E. Gravely, 727 29th Street, N. W., commended Council Member Wishneff on his point of view; however, he stated that the City must market better entertainment in order to generate more business to the area; and with regard to sporting events, the City of Roanoke should start small in order to grow big in its efforts to attract more people to the Roanoke Valley. He called attention to the need to improve air service and other modes of transportation in and out of the Roanoke Valley; and the City needs to do a better job of marketing itself to the citizens who cannot afford to attend City sponsored entertainment events. He added that wages for the average person living in the City should be increased so that the citizenry can afford to attend entertainment activities. He encouraged Council to include the wishes of the citizens of Roanoke in all of the Council's decisions.

COMMONWEALTH'S ATTORNEY: Donald M. Caldwell, Commonwealth's Attorney, advised that the cost collection unit of the Commonwealth's Attorney's Office is responsible for collection of unpaid costs and fees in the criminal court system, which provides a stream of revenue for the City of Roanoke. He stated that if a private source had collected the funds, the City would have received \$73,000.00 as opposed to \$113,000.00; whereupon, he commended Rita Mason, Cost Collector, for her efforts in connection with administering the program.

REPORTS OF OFFICERS:

CITY MANAGER:

BRIEFINGS: NONE.

ITEMS RECOMMENDED FOR ACTION:

POLICE DEPARTMENT-BUDGET-GRANTS: The City Manager submitted a communication advising that the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Act of 2000 is a unique U. S. Department of Justice initiative designed to provide a critical resource to state and local law enforcement; the grant program is managed by the Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance; and the program provides reimbursement funding on the purchase of approved bulletproof vests.

It was further advised that on August 24, 2005, the City of Roanoke was awarded \$10,983.00 for reimbursement on the purchase of 60 bulletproof vests; and vests eventually acquired through the program will be divided between the Police Department and the Sheriff's Department.

It was explained that the Local Law Enforcement Block Grant (LLEG) Program requires that all grant funds be placed in an interest bearing account; and based on interest earned during fiscal year 2003-05 and 2004-06 of LLEBG funding, additional interest earnings have been realized, or are anticipated for the grants, in the amounts of \$400.00 and \$1,500.00 respectively.

The City Manager recommended that Council accept the Bulletproof Vest Partnership reimbursement of \$10,983.00 from the Bureau of Justice Programs; that she be authorized to execute the grant agreement and any related documents, subject to approval as to form by the City Attorney; and that

Council appropriate \$10,983.00 and establish a corresponding revenue estimate in accounts to be established by the Director of Finance in the Grant Fund:

Wearing Apparel	<u>\$10,983.00</u>
Total	<u>\$10,983.00</u>

Appropriate funding of \$1,900.00 per the following and increase corresponding revenue estimates in accounts established by the Director of Finance in the Grant Fund:

Revenue

LLEBG - FY 2003-05	035-640-3550-3552	\$400.00
LLEBG - FY 2004-06	035-640-3552-3556	\$1,500.00

Expenditure

LLEBG - FY 2003-05	035-640-3550-1003	\$400.00
LLEBG - FY 2004-06	035-640-3552-1003	\$ 1,393.00
	035-640-3552-1120	\$ 107.00

Council Member Cutler offered the following budget ordinance:

(#37196-100305) AN ORDINANCE appropriating funds for the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant, amending and reordaining certain sections of the 2005-2006 Grant Fund Appropriations, and dispensing with the second reading by title of this ordinance.

(For full text of ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 70, Page 2.)

Council Member Cutler moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 37196-100305. The motion was seconded by Council Member McDaniel and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members McDaniel, Wishneff, Cutler, Dowe, Fitzpatrick, Lea and Mayor Harris-----7.

NAYS: None-----0.

FLOOD REDUCTION/CONTROL-PURCHASE/SALE OF PROPERTY-BUDGET-GRANTS: The City Manager submitted a communication advising that the City of Roanoke was awarded a grant from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the Commonwealth of Virginia Department of Emergency Management (VDEM) through the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP); the purpose of the grant was to remove a building located at 1428 10th Street, N. W., which was subject to repetitive flooding; and the building was removed and the project is complete.

It was further advised that the total project cost estimate was \$161,400.000, which included property purchase, relocation and demolition; the HMGP award covered \$153,330.00 of the proposed cost and remaining funds totaling \$8,070.00 were provided by the Capital Projects Fund, Lick Run Greenway account.

It was explained that project expenses totaled \$164,943.00 and additional revenue was received from VDEM, in the amount of \$3,543.00, for reimbursement of certain expenses incurred during the project for fiscal year 2004.

The City Manager recommended that Council adopt a budget ordinance appropriating \$3,543.00 to Account No. 035-620-3510-9007 and increase the corresponding revenue estimate by the same amount in Account No. 035-620-3510-3511.

Vice-Mayor Fitzpatrick offered the following budget ordinance:

(#37197-100305) AN ORDINANCE to appropriate additional funding for the Hazard Mitigation Grant, amending and reordaining certain sections of the 2005-2006 Grant Fund Appropriations, and dispensing with the second reading by title of this ordinance.

(For full text of ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 70, Page 3.)

Vice-Mayor Fitzpatrick moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 37197-100305. The motion was seconded by Council Member Cutler and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members McDaniel, Wishneff, Cutler, Dowe, Fitzpatrick, Lea and Mayor Harris-----7.

NAYS: None-----0.

FLOOD REDUCTION/CONTROL-PURCHASE/SALE OF PROPERTY-BUDGET-GRANTS: The City Manager submitted a communication advising that the City of Roanoke was awarded a grant from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the Commonwealth of Virginia Department of Emergency Management (VDEM) through the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP); and the purpose of the grant is to remove a residence located at 3303 Garst Mill Road, S. W., identified as Official Tax No. 5030214, which is subject to repetitive flooding and major property damage.

It was further advised that the HMGP program is entirely voluntary; Jeffrey Rogers, property owner, was notified of the program and with his concurrence, the City pursued the grant for the property; and after acquisition is complete, the structure will be demolished and the land will be dedicated to the City as permanent greenspace.

It was explained that the total project cost estimate is \$87,087.00 which includes property purchase and demolition; the HMPG award will cover \$82,733.00 of the proposed cost; remaining funds totaling \$4,354.00 are available in Account No. 008-530-9734, Miscellaneous Storm Drains Pt 2 account; and authorization is needed to move forward with procurement of title work, document preparation and acquisition of necessary property rights and eventual demolition of the structure.

The City Manager recommended the following:

- Authorize the City Manager to execute the necessary documents, in a form approved by the City Attorney, to purchase real property owned by Jeffrey Rogers, 3303 Garst Mill Road, S. W., Official Tax No. 5030214;
- Authorize demolition of the structure and close the 3303 Garst Mill Road Hazard Mitigation Grant Program grant, in accordance with requirements of FEMA;
- Adopt a budget ordinance to establish a revenue estimate in the Capital Projects Fund, in the amount of \$65,315.00, from FEMA and \$17,418.00 from VDEM, transfer \$4,354.00 from Account No. 008-530-9734-9003 (Miscellaneous Storm Drains Pt 2), and appropriate funds in the same amount to an account to be established by the Director of Finance in the Capital Projects Fund, entitled Hazard Mitigation 3303 Garst Mill Road.

Vice-Mayor Fitzpatrick offered the following budget ordinance:

(#37198-100305) AN ORDINANCE to appropriate funding received from the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program for the property on 3303 Garst Mill Road, amending and reordaining certain sections of the 2005-2006 Capital Projects Fund Appropriations, and dispensing with the second reading by title of this ordinance.

(For full text of ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 70, Page 4.)

Vice-Mayor Fitzpatrick moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 37198-100305. The motion was seconded by Council Member Cutler and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members McDaniel, Wishneff, Cutler, Dowe, Fitzpatrick, Lea and Mayor Harris-----7.

NAYS: None-----0.

Vice-Mayor Fitzpatrick offered the following ordinance:

(#37199-100305) AN ORDINANCE authorizing the acquisition and demolition of certain property located at 3303 Garst Mill Road, S. W., which is subjective to repetitive flooding, under the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) Hazard Mitigation Grant Program and the Commonwealth of Virginia Department of Emergency Management's (VDEM) through its Hazard Mitigation Grant Program, upon certain terms and conditions; authorizing the closing of the Garst Mill Road Hazard Mitigation Grant Program; and dispensing with the second reading by title of this ordinance.

(For full text of ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 70, Page 5.)

Vice-Mayor Fitzpatrick moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 37199-100305. The motion was seconded by Council Member Cutler and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members McDaniel, Wishneff, Cutler, Dowe, Fitzpatrick, Lea and Mayor Harris-----7.

NAYS: None-----0.

STATE HIGHWAYS-BUDGET: The City Manager submitted a communication advising that the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) Commonwealth Transportation Board recently awarded a total of \$744,920.00 to the City of Roanoke as part of the State's Revenue Sharing Program; and the award consists of the following projects:

- Walnut Ave. Bridge Improvements	\$242,099.00
-	
- Aviation Dr. & Towne Square Blvd. Improvement	\$335,214.00
-	
- Sidewalk Maintenance City-wide	\$167,607.00

It was further advised that the City of Roanoke sought a total of \$1,000,000.00 for the projects; however, project requests received by VDOT statewide exceeded available funding, therefore, VDOT awarded a reduced amount to each project (74.5 per cent of the original request); it is recommended that funding be appropriated to the project accounts and that preliminary engineering proceed, with the goal of developing a strategy to obtain the remaining funds that are necessary to implement the projects; and the amount of sidewalk maintenance work will be planned to coincide with available funding.

The City Manager recommended that she be authorized to enter into the necessary agreements with the Virginia Department of Transportation to locally administer and implement the above referenced projects; and that Council adopt a budget ordinance establishing revenue estimates in the Capital Projects Fund in the above referenced amounts and appropriate funds to the following project accounts:

- Walnut Ave. Bridge Improvements (008-530-9511) \$242,099.00
-
- Aviation Dr. & Towne Square (008-530-9830) \$335,214.00
-
- Sidewalk Maintenance City-wide (008-530-9793) \$167,607.00

Vice-Mayor Fitzpatrick offered the following budget ordinance:

(#37200-100305) AN ORDINANCE to appropriate funding awarded by the Virginia Department of Transportation Commonwealth Transportation Board for the Walnut Avenue Bridge Improvements, Aviation Drive & Towne Square Boulevard Improvements and Sidewalk Maintenance City-Wide Projects, amending and reordaining certain sections of the 2005-2006 Capital Projects Fund Appropriations, and dispensing with the second reading by title of this ordinance.

(For full text of ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 70, Page 6.)

Vice-Mayor Fitzpatrick moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 37200-100305. The motion was seconded by Council Member Dowe and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members McDaniel, Wishneff, Cutler, Dowe, Fitzpatrick, Lea and Mayor Harris-----7.

NAYS: None-----0.

Vice-Mayor Fitzpatrick offered the following resolution:

(#37201-100305) A RESOLUTION authorizing the City Manager to enter into an Agreement with the Roanoke Regional Airport Commission (Commission) providing for the Commission's participation in the process of designing a realignment of the intersection area of Aviation Drive and Towne Square Boulevard in return for a contribution by the Commission to the City for a portion of the costs of that process; and authorizing the City Manager to take such further action and execute such additional documents as may be necessary to implement and administer such Agreement.

(For full text of resolution, see Resolution Book No. 70, Page 7.)

Vice-Mayor Fitzpatrick moved the adoption of Resolution No. 37201-100305. The motion was seconded by Council Member Dowe and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members McDaniel, Wishneff, Cutler, Dowe, Fitzpatrick, Lea and Mayor Harris-----7.

NAYS: None-----0.

AIRPORT-BUDGET: The City Manager submitted a communication advising that Council previously appropriated \$250,000.00 toward development of a project to improve the intersection of Aviation Drive and Towne Square Boulevard; since that time, the City has obtained additional funding, in the amount of \$335,214.00, from the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) Revenue Sharing Program; in an effort to use preliminary engineering expenses as part of the City's required matching funds for the Revenue Sharing Program, the selection of a consultant and corresponding design work was scheduled to occur after VDOT's award was finalized; and now that the VDOT award is complete, staff plans to proceed with selection of a consultant and to advance project plans to 65 per cent in the hopes that the added level of detail will help to secure additional funding from both the Roanoke Regional Airport Commission and the private sector.

It was further advised that the redesigned intersection is expected to result in realignment of the Airport's main entrance; therefore, Airport staff has been involved in preliminary developments and will need to be closely involved with overall project development; recognizing the need to participate in

development of the project, the Airport has stated a willingness to fund one-third of the design costs not to exceed \$30,000.00; while Airport staff will participate on the project team, selection of the consultant and final design decisions will be made by the City of Roanoke; and a letter agreement from the Airport Commission setting forth more details was attached to the City Manager's communication.

The City Manager recommended that she be authorized to enter into an agreement with the Roanoke Regional Airport Commission in substantial conformance with the above referenced letter agreement; such agreement to be approved as to form by the City Attorney; and that Council adopt a budget ordinance to establish a revenue estimate in the Capital Projects Fund in the amount of \$30,000.00, and appropriate the funds to Aviation & Towne Square Boulevard, Account No. 008-530-9830.

Council Member Cutler offered the following budget ordinance:

(#37202-100305) AN ORDINANCE to appropriate additional funding for the Aviation Drive and Towne Square Boulevard Improvement Project, amending and reordaining certain sections of the 2005-2006 Capital Projects Fund Appropriations, and dispensing with the second reading by title of this ordinance.

(For full text of ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 70, Page 8.)

Council Member Cutler moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 37202-100305. The motion was seconded by Council Member McDaniel and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members McDaniel, Wishneff, Cutler, Dowe, Fitzpatrick, Lea and Mayor Harris-----7.

NAYS: None-----0.

Council Member Dowe offered the following resolution:

(#37203-100305) A RESOLUTION authorizing the City Manager to enter into an Agreement with the Roanoke Regional Airport Commission (Commission) providing for the Commission's participation in the process of designing a realignment of the intersection area of Aviation Drive and Towne Square Boulevard in return for a contribution by the Commission to the City for a portion of the costs of that process; and authorizing the City Manager to take such further action and execute such additional documents as may be necessary to implement and administer such Agreement.

(For full text of resolution, see Resolution Book No. 70, Page 9.)

Council Member Dowe moved the adoption of Resolution No. 37203-100305. The motion was seconded by Council Member Cutler and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members McDaniel, Wishneff, Cutler, Dowe, Fitzpatrick, Lea and Mayor Harris-----7.

NAYS: None-----0.

Council Member Dowe requested a time table for commencement of the Towne Square Aviation Drive project; whereupon, the City Manager advised that she could not answer the question specifically and would forward a response to Council following the meeting after conferring with City staff.

BUDGET-ARTS MUSEUM OF WESTERN VA: The City Manager submitted a communication advising that on June 20, 2005, Council authorized issuance of \$3.7 million in General Obligation Bonds for the new Art Museum of Western Virginia; the City of Roanoke pledged \$4 million for the project; the first payment of \$300,000.00 was appropriated in October 2000; the second payment of \$2.5 million is to be appropriated upon certification that funding to commence the construction has been secured; and the third payment of \$1.2 million will occur upon certification that the project is 50 per cent complete.

It was further advised that on June 16, 2003, Council authorized issuance of \$14.3 million in General Obligation Bonds for the Civic Center Expansion/Renovation project; and during fiscal year 2004-2005, \$7,895,000.00 of the \$14.3 million in General Obligation Bonds was issued, with the balance of \$6,405,000.00 to be issued during fiscal year 2005-2006.

It was noted that funding needs to be appropriated in advance of bond issuance to facilitate the second payment to the Art Museum of Western Virginia and to encumber funds for the balance of the construction contract for the Civic Center Expansion/Renovation project.

The City Manager recommended that Council adopt a budget ordinance appropriating \$2,500,000.00 for the Art Museum of Western Virginia to an account to be established in the Capital Projects Fund by the Director of Finance and appropriating \$6,405,000.00 for Civic Facilities Expansion & Renovation, Account No. 005-550-8616.

Council Member Cutler offered the following budget ordinance:

(#37204-100305) AN ORDINANCE to appropriate funding to be provided by the Series 2005 Bonds to various capital projects, amending and reordaining certain sections of the 2005-2006 Civic Facilities and Capital Projects Fund Appropriations and dispensing with the second reading by title of this ordinance.

(For full text of ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 70, Page 10.)

Council Member Cutler moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 37204-100305. The motion was seconded by Vice-Mayor Fitzpatrick and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members McDaniel, Wishneff, Cutler, Dowe, Fitzpatrick, Lea and Mayor Harris-----7.

NAYS: None-----0.

BUDGET-CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM: The City Manager submitted a communication advising that the following miscellaneous funds have been received by the City of Roanoke and need to be applied to the appropriate project accounts:

- The City of Roanoke had Lumsden Associates, P.C. perform a boundary line adjustment survey between the City of Roanoke and Roanoke County; total project cost was \$16,600.00 which was divided between Roanoke County (\$7,700.00) for the Vinyard Park II portion, the City of Roanoke (\$5,400.00) for the Wastewater Treatment Plant portion, and Rockydale Quarries Corporation (\$3,500.00) for the Route 220 and Draper Road portion; revenue was received on October 26, 2004, from Roanoke County in the amount of \$7,700.00 and revenue was received from Rockydale Quarries in the amount of \$3,500.00.
- The City of Roanoke had a report prepared by Spectrum Design, P.C. entitled "Center in the Square Chiller Plant Study" in conjunction with the City Market Building HVAC Study to evaluate the possibility of developing a central chiller plant for Center in the Square and the City Market Building; Center in the Square agreed to share the cost of the study with the City of Roanoke; the cost of the study totaled \$9,000.00 and revenue was received from Center in the Square on May 28, 2004, in the amount of \$4,500.

- The City of Roanoke initially paid for an abandoned fuel tank to be removed from the Fire Station & Fire Administration site located at Elm Avenue and Franklin Road; the Department of Environmental Quality reimbursed the City of Roanoke for a portion of the cost of removal of the tank; and revenue was received from the Department of Environmental Quality on February 2, 2005, in the amount of \$2,097.00.
- Lamar Advertising Company damaged a portion of an embankment that had already been graded and permanently seeded on the proposed stadium-amphitheater site while performing work on certain billboards; a quotation in the amount of \$988.90 was obtained from the contractor, Branch Highways, Inc., to make the necessary repairs and was given to Lamar Advertising Company; and revenue was received from Lamar Advertising Company on October 26, 2004, in the amount of \$988.00.
- *The Roanoke Times* requested a copy of the Victory Stadium Condition Assessment and Evaluation report that was prepared by Sutton-Kennerly & Associates, Inc., at a cost of \$100.00; and revenue was received from *The Roanoke Times* on April 14, 2005, in the amount of \$100.00.

It was further advised that funding needs to be appropriated and revenue estimates need to be increased as follows:

Appropriate This Amount	To This Account Number	Increase Revenue Estimate for Same Amount in this Account Number
\$11,200.00	008-530-9818-9003	008-530-9818-9810
\$ 4,500.00	008-530-9767-9003	008-530-9767-9805
\$ 2,097.00	008-530-9678-9003	008-530-9678-9802
\$ 988.00	008-530-9758-9003	008-008-1234-1293
\$ 100.00	008-530-9758-9003	008-530-9758-9812

The City Manager recommended that Council adopt a budget ordinance appropriating the above referenced funds and increasing corresponding revenue estimates for the same amounts as set forth in the above referenced accounts.

Vice-Mayor Fitzpatrick offered the following budget ordinance:

(#37205-100305) AN ORDINANCE to appropriate funding for various capital projects, amending and reordaining certain sections of the 2005-2006 Capital Projects Fund Appropriations, and dispensing with the second reading by title of this ordinance.

(For full text of ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 70, Page 11.)

Vice-Mayor Fitzpatrick moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 37205-100305. The motion was seconded by Council Member Dowe and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members McDaniel, Wishneff, Cutler, Dowe, Fitzpatrick, Lea and Mayor Harris-----7.

NAYS: None-----0.

COMMUNITY PLANNING-CITY EMPLOYEES-HOUSING/AUTHORITY: The City Manager introduced Ford P. Weber, Director of Housing and Neighborhood Services, effective October 3, 2005.

DONATIONS/CONTRIBUTIONS-FLOOD REDUCTION/CONTROL-FIRE DEPARTMENT: The City Manager called attention to a resolution that Council is requested to adopt that will allow the City of Roanoke to donate surplus vehicles to the Chambers of Commerce of localities that were affected by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.

The City Manager announced that after several weeks of attempting to connect the City of Roanoke with a city in one of the states affected by the hurricanes, a cooperation arrangement was developed with the City of Gulfport, Mississippi, and with adoption of the above referenced resolution, up to 20 vehicles will be donated to the Gulfport Chamber of Commerce which will ensure that the City of Gulfport is the recipient of the vehicles. She stated that while Roanoke City officials have spoken at length with officials of Gulfport, all details regarding the needs of the community are not known, although it has been indicated that vehicles and building inspections are top priorities. She advised that City employees have been anxiously awaiting the opportunity to be of assistance, but it was necessary to ensure that all of the proper protocols

were observed through the Commonwealth of Virginia and the State of Mississippi and to also ensure that FEMA endorses and approves any actions that were taken. She stated that through the efforts of the City's Service Excellence Committee, a bake sale was held last week that netted \$1,500.00 that will go to hurricane victims, and it is hoped that the funds will go directly to the residents of the City of Gulfport; earlier in the day, six members of the City's Department of Fire/EMS were deployed to Lake Charles, Louisiana, for 15 days and their primary mission will be planning and rescuing at high level, and following the first 15 days, they will be replaced by six additional members of the Fire/EMS Department for another period of 15 days. She added that the first group to be deployed this morning consisted of Battalion Chief Jeff Beckner, who will lead the group and is trained in incident management, heavy tactical rescue training; Captain Warner VanDame who is trained in hazardous materials; Captain Todd Stone who is trained in water rescue and medical heavy technical rescue; Captain Kent McElwaine, who is a paramedic trained in pre hospital medical care; First Lieutenant Phillip Dillon, who is trained in search, rescue and training; and Lieutenant Chad Whittleberry, who is a paramedic trained in heavy tactical rescue. She advised that with Council's adoption of the above referenced resolution, the City will begin to make arrangements for surplus vehicles, which include vehicles that were to be auctioned later during the fiscal year, to be delivered to the City of Gulfport; and later in the week, she will advise of the deployment of additional non public safety resources to the Gulfport, Mississippi, area.

Vice-Mayor Fitzpatrick inquired if some of the funds that are raised in the Roanoke Valley could be directed specifically to the City of Gulfport in an effort to establish a more long term relationship.

The City Manager responded that by Wednesday, October 5, the City should have in hand a full list of needs that will be shared with the community to enable Roanoke's citizens to more specifically direct their resources, whether they are monetary or other identified needs, to assist in the delivery of assistance to the Gulfport community. She stated that it is hoped that the entire Roanoke community and perhaps the Roanoke Valley would rally around those communities that are being matched up with cities like Roanoke to ensure that the resources are effectively deployed to the various communities.

Vice-Mayor Fitzpatrick suggested that the Mayor or the City Manager contact other localities in the Roanoke Metropolitan Statistical Area to encourage their support of efforts to assist localities affected by the recent hurricanes.

Council Member Cutler suggested that Roanoke area service groups and organizations such as the Kiwanis Club or the Rotary Club be encouraged to determine how they may contribute and to consider the adoption of "sister" groups in those areas affected by the recent hurricanes.

Council Member Cutler offered the following resolution:

(#37206-100305) A RESOLUTION authorizing the City Manager to donate up to twenty (20) surplus vehicles to the chambers of commerce for localities affected by hurricanes Katrina and Rita.

(For full text of resolution, see Resolution Book No. 70, Page 12.)

Council Member Cutler moved the adoption of Resolution No. 37206-100305. The motion was seconded by Council Member Dowe and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members McDaniel, Wishneff, Cutler, Dowe, Fitzpatrick, Lea and Mayor Harris-----7.

NAYS: None-----0.

CITY COUNCIL: A communication from the City Manager requesting that Council convene in Closed Session to discuss a matter with regard to acquisition of real property, pursuant to Section 2.2-3711(A)(3), Code of Virginia (1950), as amended, was before the body.

Vice-Mayor Fitzpatrick moved that Council concur in the request of the City Manager to convene in Closed Session as above described. The motion was seconded by Council Member Dowe and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members McDaniel, Wishneff, Cutler, Dowe, Fitzpatrick, Lea and Mayor Harris-----7.

NAYS: None-----0.

At 4:30 p.m., the Mayor declared the Council meeting in recess for one Closed Session to interview two applicants for a vacancy on the Roanoke City School Board.

At 5:50 p.m., the Council meeting reconvened in the City Council Chamber, with all Members of the Council in attendance, Mayor Harris presiding.

DIRECTOR OF FINANCE:

AUDITS/FINANCIAL REPORTS: The Director of Finance submitted the Financial Report for the month of August 2005.

(For full text, see financial report on file in the City Clerk's Office.)

The Director of Finance advised that the City is two months into the fiscal year which is included in the August financial report; and just under six per cent growth is anticipated in revenues and expenditures for this budget year. He stated that staff will closely monitor local business taxes due to the spike in fuel prices that will eat into consumer discretionary spending, which generates sales tax, meals tax, admissions tax, room tax, etc.

There being no further discussion and without objection by Council, the Mayor advised that the Financial Report for the month of August would be received and filed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES: NONE.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: NONE.

INTRODUCTION AND CONSIDERATION OF ORDINANCES AND RESOLUTIONS:

OATHS OF OFFICE-COMMITTEES-INDUSTRIES: Council Member Cutler offered the following resolution reappointing S. Deborah Oyler as a Director of the Industrial Development Authority of the City of Roanoke, Virginia, for a term of four years, commencing October 21, 2005:

(#37207-100305) A RESOLUTION reappointing a Director of the Industrial Development Authority of the City of Roanoke to fill a four (4) year term on the Board of Directors.

(For full text of resolution, see Resolution Book No. 70, Page 13.)

Council Member Cutler moved the adoption of Resolution No. 37207-100305. The motion was seconded by Council Member Dowe and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members McDaniel, Wishneff, Cutler, Dowe, Fitzpatrick, Lea and Mayor Harris-----7.

NAYS: None-----0.

OATHS OF OFFICE-COMMITTEES-INDUSTRIES: Vice-Mayor Fitzpatrick offered the following resolution reappointing Stuart H. Revercomb, as a Director of the Industrial Development Authority of the City of Roanoke, Virginia, for a term of four years, commencing October 21, 2005:

(#37208-100305) A RESOLUTION reappointing a Director of the Industrial Development Authority of the City of Roanoke to fill a four (4) year term on the Board of Directors.

(For full text of resolution, see Resolution Book No. 70, Page 14.)

Vice-Mayor Fitzpatrick moved the adoption of Resolution No. 37208-100305. The motion was seconded by Council Member Dowe and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members McDaniel, Wishneff, Cutler, Dowe, Fitzpatrick, Lea and Mayor Harris-----7.

NAYS: None-----0.

MOTIONS AND MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:

INQUIRIES AND/OR COMMENTS BY THE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF COUNCIL: NONE.

HEARING OF CITIZENS UPON PUBLIC MATTERS: The Mayor advised that Council sets this time as a priority for citizens to be heard and matters requiring referral to the City Manager will be referred immediately for response, recommendation or report to Council.

ROANOKE CIVIC CENTER-DISABLED PERSONS: Ms. Debra Caldwell-Shelton, 2817 Lyndhurst Street, N. W., expressed concern that there are no wheelchair ramps around the Roanoke Civic Center.

The City Manager advised that a ramp located at the front of the Civic Center leads up to the plaza and provides access to the Coliseum and to the Performing Arts Theatre, an elevator is available in the Performing Arts Theater, and two lifts are available in the Coliseum to take occupants of wheelchairs to the Coliseum floor. The City Manager advised that a member of the City staff would contact Ms. Shelton to discuss her specific concerns and/or any unusual circumstances.

Ms. Shelton advised that it was stated at a City Council meeting that all streets and sidewalks in the City of Roanoke are wheelchair accessible; however, she noted that this is not a true statement.

The Mayor advised that no claim has been made by the City Council or the City Manager that all City streets and all sidewalks are handicapped accessible.

HOUSING/AUTHORITY: Mr. Robert E. Gravely, 727 29th Street, N. W., spoke with regard to the cost of housing in the City of Roanoke. He referred specifically to houses on Day Avenue, S. W., that are proposed to be renovated by the Roanoke Redevelopment and Housing Authority and will be sold in the price range of \$250,000.00 – \$300,000.00. He also referred to vacant houses on Madison Avenue and at the corner of 5th Street, N. W., that sell for \$100,000.00 – \$124,000.00, and a vacant house on Gilmer Avenue that sells for \$85,000.00 which is deteriorating due to vandalism and lack of occupancy. He stated that any person who can afford to purchase a house valued at \$100,000.00 – \$300,000.00 will not choose to buy a house in those areas of the City. He expressed concern that the average City employee cannot afford to purchase a house in the City of Roanoke because the average City worker earns less than a mother with four children on public assistance.

PROCLAMATIONS–POLICE DEPARTMENT: Ms. Evelyn D. Bethel, 35 Patton Avenue, N. E., complimented the Chief of Police and especially Officer S. S. Camp on the manner in which a potentially dangerous situation involving an elderly relative was resolved. She stated that the quick response by Officer Camp prevented what could have been a dangerous incident for an elderly citizen.

CITY MANAGER COMMENTS:

CITY MARKET–CELEBRATIONS–DISABLED PERSONS: The City Manager advised that beginning on October 3, 2005, parking tickets will be issued by downtown parking ticket enforcement officers using handheld computers that print easy to read tickets on water proof paper.

The City Manager called attention to the following activities:

- Fall Waterways Cleanup and Celebration which was held on Saturday, October 1, 2005, from 8:30 a.m. – 2:00 p.m., along the banks of the Roanoke River.

- 2005 Business Festival on Saturday, October 1, 2005, which was held at the Goodwill Industries parking lot on Melrose Avenue from 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.
- Kickoff for the City Market Study which was held on Saturday, October 1, 2005, at 11:00 a.m.
- Fall Festival which was held on the City Market on Saturday, October 1, 2005, from 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.
- Roanoke River Flood Reduction Project ground breaking to be held on Tuesday, October 4, 2005, at 10:00 a.m., at the Roanoke River next to the 9th Street Bridge.
- Presentation of a report by the consultant on the Roanoke Public Library on October 3, 2005, at 6:00 p.m., at the Jefferson Center.
- Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation Walk on Sunday, September 25, 2005, from 2:00 p.m. to 5:30 p.m.

At 6:10 p.m., the Mayor declared the Council meeting in recess for one Closed Session in the Council's Conference Room.

At 7:05 p.m., the Council meeting reconvened in the City Council Chamber, with all Members of the Council in attendance, Mayor Harris presiding.

COUNCIL: With respect to the Closed Session just concluded, Council Member Cutler moved that each Member of City Council certify to the best of his or her knowledge that: (1) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements under the Virginia Freedom of Information Act; and (2) only such public business matters as were identified in any motion by which any Closed Meeting was convened were heard, discussed or considered by City Council. The motion was seconded by Vice-Mayor Fitzpatrick and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members McDaniel, Wishneff, Cutler, Dowe, Fitzpatrick, Lea and Mayor Harris-----7.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Member Dowe left the meeting during the Closed Session.)

OATHS OF OFFICE-COMMITTEES-SCHOOLS: The Mayor advised that there is a vacancy on the Roanoke City School Board created by the resignation of Gloria P. Manns, for a term ending June 30, 2006; whereupon, he advised that the following persons applied for the vacancy:

Jason E. Bingham
Randy L. Leftwich
Elias A. Zaney

John W. Elliott, Jr.
Carla L. Terry

The Mayor requested that Council Members cast their vote for one person to fill the vacancy.

FOR MR. BINGHAM: Council Members McDaniel, Wishneff, Cutler, Vice-Mayor Fitzpatrick and Mayor Harris-----5.

FOR MS. TERRY: Council Member Lea-----1.

FOR MR. LEFTWICH: NONE-----0.

FOR MR. ELLIOTT: NONE -----0.

FOR MR. ZANEY: NONE-----0.

(Council Member Dowe was absent.)

The Mayor announced that Jason E. Bingham was appointed to fill the unexpired term of Gloria P. Manns, resigned, ending June 30, 2006, as a Trustee of the Roanoke City School Board.

OATHS OF OFFICE-COMMITTEES-ROANOKE CIVIC CENTER: The Mayor advised that there is a vacancy on the Roanoke Civic Center Commission, created by expiration of the term of office of Mark E. Feldmann; whereupon, he opened the floor for nominations to fill the vacancy.

Vice-Mayor Fitzpatrick placed in nomination the name of Brownie Polly.

There being no further nominations, Mr. Polly was appointed as a member of the Roanoke Civic Center Commission, for a term ending September 30, 2008, by the following vote:

FOR MR. POLLY: Council Members McDaniel, Wishneff, Cutler, Dowe, Fitzpatrick, Lea and Mayor Harris -----6.

(Council Member Dowe was absent.)

There being no further business, the Mayor declared the Council meeting adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

A P P R O V E D

ATTEST:

Mary F. Parker
City Clerk

C. Nelson Harris
Mayor
